



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 148

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 2, 2002

No. 53

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Reverend Monsignor Michael J. Bransfield, Rector, Basilica of the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

God, our Creator, You formed us in Your own image and likeness and call on us to act in righteousness and faith.

Bless our Nation and sustain it by Your grace.

Make it an example and promoter of harmony and goodwill.

Give the Members of this legislative body wisdom, prudence, and courage in conducting its affairs in service to the American people.

Let its actions today and always be inclined toward true justice and marked by diligent, noble initiative.

Preserve our troops at home and abroad, keep them safe from harm in their efforts to protect our freedom and welfare.

Grant peace and mutual respect to the peoples of the Middle East; may they enjoy both security in their lands and serenity in their hearts.

Finally, we thank You for Your merciful attention to the supplications offered throughout the United States on this national day of prayer.

We are grateful for Your continuing sustenance and desirous of fulfilling Your will for peace and prosperity in our Nation and the world. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BEREUTER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING CANADA'S PRIME MINISTER

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, America is blessed to have in Canada not only a neighbor but also a steadfast ally and true friend. While our geographic bonds are obvious, it is our deep cultural, political, and economic ties that will forever bind us. Therefore, it is my distinct honor to welcome to Washington today the Honorable Peter Milliken, the Speaker of the House of Commons of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I remind Members that this past October, only 1 month after the fateful September day, parliamentarians from all NATO nations met in Ottawa, Canada, for the fall meeting of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly. At that meeting, the assembly endorsed the use of force responsible for the horrific attacks on America. Our Canadian hosts that day, as all parliamentarians, knew the significant risk associated with the endeavor.

So it is with great sadness that we stand here today following the deaths of four Canadian soldiers, killed while on a mission to fight terror in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, I say to Speaker Milliken and to all Canadians, we remain deeply saddened by their loss and America thanks them for their steadfast partnership.

EXPRESSING DEMOCRATIC WELCOME TO SPEAKER OF THE CANADIAN PARLIAMENT

(Mr. LANTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my good friend on the Republican side, Mr. BEREUTER, to express to the distinguished Speaker of the Canadian Parliament Democratic support and appreciation of the generations-long friendship and solidarity the Canadian people have shown to us.

There is no nation on the face of this planet which is a more dependable and a more solid and a more persistent ally and friend of the United States than is Canada. Through many wars we have stood together, and we have prevailed as we shall in this war on global terrorism.

War inevitably entails losses. No losses are more tragic and more heart rending than the ones we call losses related to "friendly fire." This means we kill our own by mistake, by error, through a tragedy. That is what happened, in Afghanistan, to four Canadian soldiers, and the American people are as one in expressing our heartfelt condolences to the families of these four heroes and to all of the Canadian people.

We want to assure Speaker Milliken that Canada and the United States will stand together forever on behalf of defending freedom, democracy, human rights, the rule of law, the right of civilized societies to live in peace and security. We appreciate the friendship of our Canadian friends, and we want to assure them of our solidarity and respect.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain further 1-minutes at the end of business today.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2021

FARM SECURITY AND RURAL
INVESTMENT ACT OF 2002

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 403 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 403

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2646) to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2011. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY). The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 403 waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration. The rule provides that the conference report shall be considered as read.

Adopting this rule would allow the full House of Representatives to consider the conference report to accompany H.R. 2646, the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002.

Yesterday, the Rules Committee approved this rule, which is a standard rule governing consideration of the conference report.

Before closing, I want to acknowledge my friends and colleagues on the House Agriculture Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST), the chairman, and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the subcommittee chairman, who have spent a considerable amount of time on this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule on the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) for yielding me the time.

This rule will waive all points of order against the conference report to accompany H.R. 2646. This is the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002.

I want to commend the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), and their staffs for their hard work on this bipartisan legislation. I also want to express my appreciation to Senators HARKIN and LUGAR, chairman and ranking member of the Senate Agriculture Committee for their tireless efforts as well.

I would also like to single out the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) and Senator LEAHY for their contributions to the bill and their steadfast work as champions of hungry people in this country and around the world.

This bill will increase farm program spending by \$73.5 billion over the next 10 years. The measure boosts government subsidies for major crops, while at the same time it directs more conservation payments to small farmers. The measure also provides funding for trade promotion, nutrition programs, for rural development, and agriculture research.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grateful that this legislation includes the Bill Emerson-Mickey Leland Hunger Fellows Program. This is a fitting tribute to our late colleagues, and it honors their legacy by training leaders in the fight against hunger.

I am pleased that the measure provides \$100 million in fiscal year 2003 for the Global Food for Education initiative, and I am particularly gratified that this legislation authorizes the George McGovern-Robert Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program. This initiative, commonly known as the Global School Lunch Program, will continue and expand the good work of the Global Food for Education Initiative.

The Global School Lunch Program was inspired in a bipartisan fashion by former Senators George McGovern and Bob Dole, and it began as a pilot program in July of 2000. Under the bill we are considering today, this initiative will make a real difference in the lives of tens of millions of children all over the world. The program will feed not only hungry children, but it promotes education abroad, in addition to assisting American farmers.

This program is already doing a wonderful job encouraging children to attend school, especially girls. One example is in Pakistan, near the border with Afghanistan. Partnered with the World Food Programme, the Global School Lunch Program provides families with cooking oil if their daughters go to school. This is boosting attendance and improving performance; and important to our own national security, this program keeps the kids away from the madrahas, schools funded by radical Islamic militants where students are fed a diet of hate for America. Because of the Global School Lunch Program, the students learn that America cares about them.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report includes an amendment I offered on the House floor which was accepted by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) and adopted by the House. The amendment allows greater flexibility to use assistance funds for transporting food where it is needed. This provision will remove a bottleneck which can hinder the abilities of both the World Food Programme and private charities to distribute food aid.

In our own country, this measure restores food stamps to legal immigrants who have lived in the United States for 5 years. This is a needed change from the Welfare Reform Act of 1996, and it was a top priority of the antihunger community.

The bill provides an overall increase of \$6.4 billion for domestic nutrition programs. This includes increases for the TEFAP program and the WIC Farmers Market Nutrition Program. These programs do help hungry people. They put food on the empty plates of Americans in need.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I do want to express my concern about the future of international food aid. This bill does increase slightly the Food for Progress program. However, if the administration follows through with its stated intentions to reduce surplus commodity donations through section 416(b), this will amount to a drastic cut in overall food assistance. This could result in a loss of almost \$1 billion to feed hungry people next year.

This is totally unacceptable anytime, but it is even more tragic when the serious threat of famine looms in southern Africa, and the situation in war-torn Afghanistan is still shaky at best. I hope the administration will use the flexibility it has to ensure food aid is not cut.

American farmers are the most productive in the world, and our compassion is second to none. We need to strengthen that bond between our generosity and abundance and the outstretched arms and empty stomachs of the world's hungry people.

This bill is a step in that direction. We have a long journey still ahead to end hunger in our world. Mr. Speaker, I support this rule and the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1015

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. With respect to this bill before us today, there is no doubt that the bill is imperfect. One could argue it spends too much. One could argue it should probably do more to reform some of our USDA programs. But let me say this: In the area of dairy, this is a historic win for dairy farmers all across America.

In my home area in Wisconsin, we are losing some 3 to 4 dairy farms each and every day. There are 3 reasons why this bill will help. Number 1, it creates a new countercyclical program for dairy; a program I hope never goes into effect. We all hope dairy prices remain strong. But in the event the dairy economy crashes, as it did a few years ago, this will give them a safety net. This is money they can take to the bank.

Number 2, this program is national, not regional. For years our policies

have pit farmer against farmer, States against State, region against region. And we will still do that in the area of milk marketing orders, but with respect to the new countercyclical program, we break away from that. This is a historic step towards a new national policy.

And number 3, this program pays out without regard to end use of milk. Even though the trigger price for this countercyclical program is pegged to Class I, the payouts will go to all classes of milk whether it remains fluid or whether it goes into manufactured milk products.

There is more work to be done on the dairy front, to be sure, but this is a great step forwards. I congratulate the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST); the chairman of the Subcommittee on Livestock and Horticulture, the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO); and the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), and all the conferees. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the bill.

This is a big win for the dairy farmers in Wisconsin.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, for the last 68 days, I have joined my House colleagues, 11 of them, to work on resolving differences in a farm bill between a bill we passed last summer and a bill passed a few months ago by the United States Senate.

During those 68 days, I have come to greatly admire and respect the leadership in our Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST), our chairman, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), our ranking member. But why have we made this effort? Why does it matter? I think the answer is because we care about the future of our farmers and our ranchers, and we care about the future of the communities in which they live.

There is absolutely no doubt but that the times in agriculture country are tough. They are not getting better, they are getting worse. The profit margins are squeezed.

Last month, I conducted 66 town hall meetings from A to Z, Almena to Zurich. Record low prices for weather conditions paint a terribly bleak picture for our farm families. This week's headlines in the Kansas press: "High Input Costs, Lower Livestock Income Cut Kansas Farm Income 28.6 Percent"; "Bankers Indicate That Farm-Related Businesses Continue To Struggle"; and "Falling Prices Mean Big Losses for Cattle Feeders."

The average farm income for a Kansas farmer totaled less than \$28,000 per farm. Total farm expenses increased 7 percent. The average debt for a farmer increased 34 percent. Farmers used to spend \$81 for every dollar's worth of

product they sold. Today it is \$87. Cattle prices are down, meaning that our producers have lost \$120 on every animal they sell. For a 10,000-head feed yard in Ashland, Kansas, that feeder has just lost \$1.2 million.

These are the stories I have heard over the last month in 66 locations across my district. It is time for us to step forward.

I have a farm bill, a sale bill, that a constituent sent me, indicating that her neighbor was selling out the farm because they could not make it. And the note was, I have a young man who wants to take over my farm.

This is why we need a farm bill, so that that next generation has the opportunity to be farmers, to feed the world. It is about maintaining the safest and most abundant supply and having our consumers receive the safest food supply at the grocery store. It is about preserving our environment for future generations, conserving our natural resources, protecting our water quality and air. It is about helping rural communities sustain their economies. It is about ensuring adequate nutrition for all Americans, especially our children. But for Kansas it is about avoiding the headlines that say, "On the Auction Block: Farmers Getting Out, Putting Items, Land Up For Sell During Tough Economic Times."

This bill is valuable to the Kansas economy and it is valuable in our efforts to keep farmers on the land, to keep shoppers on our main streets, and to keep children in our schools. If we do not act now, next year will be too late for many family farms.

The wheat crop is in the ground. In just over a month we will begin harvest in my State, and planning is under way for our other crops. Farmers need details of a farm bill sooner, not later, and I urge my colleagues to support this farm bill and to vote for the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the Kansas press article I referred to earlier:

[From the Garden City Telegram, Apr. 11, 2002]

ON THE AUCTION BLOCK

GETTING OUT: FARMERS PUTTING ITEMS, LAND UP FOR SELL DURING TOUGH ECONOMIC TIMES
(By Kathy Hanks)

Gary Brooks is sifting through a collection of nuts, bolts and used tractor parts deciding what to sell Saturday at his farm auction.

Brooks and his wife, Carla, have farmed in the Healy area for 37 years. And though he describes the upcoming sale as "bittersweet," the Brookes are ready to get out of farming and make a life change.

"We can see the handwriting on the wall. We've been pretty small farmers, and we just can't get enough for what we raise," Brooks said. "My machinery is older, and it takes about two years of crops to fix something that breaks."

The couple has made some major decisions in the past months.

"If your mind is made up, then it's a positive thing. If someone else is telling you that you have to get out, then that's sad," Brooks said.

They had a land auction earlier this year; selling about three-and-a-half quarters of

ground. After Saturday's sale, the couple plans to move to Hays, where they will be close to children and grandchildren.

"I don't know what kind of job I'll get, but I sure don't want to work on commission; I've been doing that for years," he said. "I want a job with a regular paycheck. I have a degree in botany, but I don't know what kind of work I can find with that."

Brooks, however, said he is not too concerned.

"This is our decision. We'll walk away with a little money. And I'll be grinning all the way," he said.

Every weekend in April, Russell Berning, owner of Berning Auction, Marienthal, has a farm auction scheduled somewhere in western Kansas.

"I wouldn't call these forced sales. I'd call them encouraged sales. The owners can see there's no future, and they want to get out while they still have something left," Berning said.

He has been in the auction business since the late 1980s, beginning just as the bad economic times and forced sales were ending.

Though farm sales are on the increase, he said what he is observing today is nothing compared to the 1980s, when many farm families were forced out of operation.

"At least for now, the mood is more of relief to be getting out of farming," Berning said.

There are no "Penney Auctions" taking place where the neighbors come and buy your land and machinery for pennies, then return it to you.

Instead, your neighbor is more likely to buy your ground.

"In western Kansas, we are seeing dry land sell for upwards of \$725 per acre. People are buying the land. There are some guys still willing to take a chance with low interest rates," Berning said. "And there is the old money farmers who have been on the land for generations. That's where most of the sales are coming from."

Berning described the typical farmer selling his land as in his 50s and wanting to do something different with his life.

"I know some guys who are going into the insurance business, working as federal crop adjusters. That's a job where they still will be able to use their knowledge and still be involved with the farming aspect," he said. "I see them selling their land and looking forward to doing something different."

According to Berning, several of his recent sales have been in the Healy area of Lane County.

"They have had some dryer years in the past than some areas around them. It has just hit them earlier. If we don't get any more moisture, and prices don't change, we're going to see more of this. I think we're just on the verge right now," Berning said.

Along with land, he is selling a lot of farm equipment.

"A lot of what I'm selling is good, modern equipment in good shape, that is bringing in good money," Berning said. "The older, smaller equipment has taken a significant drop in price."

At Scott Auction, Garden City, Kent Scott was observing a similar situation with farm auctions.

"I'm not seeing an increase in forced sales. Instead, I see farmers trying to get rid of things on their depreciation schedule that they have quit using on the farm," Scott said. "They may be cutting back their operation because of economics. Prices are not good. So, some are selling out now when they still have their equity."

Berning agrees with that scenario.

"I have seen farmers selling their farm equipment and then just look for other work. They want to sell their land while they still

have some money left to start a new life." Berning said. "Things aren't bad right now. It could get worse. And they do appear that they will get worse before they get better."

In the southwest corner of the state, Jim Carrithers, owner of Carrithers Auction of Johnson City, said he is not seeing a noticeable change in farm sales.

"I can't see any increase in farm sales with farmers going out of business," said Carrithers, who conducts auctions in southwest Kansas, eastern Colorado and the Oklahoma panhandle. "We have always had farmers who made the decision to get out. They can see they aren't getting anywhere and would prefer to work for a company with insurance benefits."

"I am seeing just an average year, no different than what I've observed in the past 30 years of being in the business. Farmers just need some rain and a better farm program."

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON), who has been a great representative. We are going to miss her, and she is a great fighter for this issue.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and this Congress is going to miss the gentleman from Ohio as well, but he is going to serve in another great capacity.

I wanted to say that after almost 2 years, the House and the Senate have finally come together on a farm bill, and the rule that we will vote on is a rule that is appropriate and I will vote for the rule.

Is this farm bill a perfect farm bill? Absolutely not. Is it a farm bill that will help many farmers? It indeed will. Are there areas I wish it had gone further? There are. Are there areas where I think it went too far? Yes. As in all legislation, there are winners and losers in this. But all in all, this farm bill speaks to providing a safety net that is critical.

I want to spend just a moment saying it does do things that we would be very, very proud of. It provides \$6.4 billion over the next 10 years for nutrition. In addition to that, it provides \$100 million for global food services that will provide education and food to a lot of children, making a difference in their lives, not only to girls, but families.

When girls learn, their families learn. It has been demonstrated that when young girls have an education, not only is that education good for themselves but it is good for the families. So when we indeed provide food for young children to learn, we are enabling their families to be more productive and healthy.

I would be remiss not to make mention that this global food program has been kind of the brainchild of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON), and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN). They have labored tirelessly. It is called formally the Dole and McGovern bill. Both of them wanted this bill.

This is an opportunity for us to share our bounty, to make a difference in the

lives of those we help through our foreign affairs. This goes a long way to say who we are as human beings; that our American farmers wish to share their bounty with the people of the rest of the world.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAN MILLER).

Mr. DAN MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this agriculture welfare bill we will be voting on later this morning.

In 1996, this Congress passed 2 historic pieces of legislation; one was Welfare Reform and one was the Freedom to Farm. The idea was to get people less dependent on government, to get people more opportunity and more freedom. The Welfare Reform bill has been a success. We have reduced the welfare rolls by 50 percent, but, more importantly, we have given people the freedom and opportunity for their American dream, to not have to rely on a check from the Federal Government. And that was the concept with Freedom to Farm, but it did not work out quite right. We are just pouring money into the program every year classified as emergency spending, and now this year we are going to make it all entitlement spending and make more people dependent on the Federal Government.

This bill, sadly, goes in the wrong direction, in that it costs more for the American taxpayer, it costs the American consumer more, and it is this same reliance on Federal Government handouts that is so unfortunate. Most of the money goes just to a handful of crops; wheat, rice, corn, cotton, and soybeans. But it goes into a lot of other areas, and that is how it gets its widespread support on the floor of the House. We got rid of wool, mohair, and honey subsidies in 1996, but they are back. So now the taxpayers are going to subsidize wool, mohair, and honey.

We have added some things, like small chickpeas, dry peas, and lentils. I do not know why the Federal Government has to be in this business. The peanut program, and I like peanuts, but it is going to be, I think, like a \$4 billion cost to the American taxpayers. This whole bill, they say, is only 77-some billion. But that is on top of the \$100 billion entitlement right there now. So it will cost \$170 billion. And if we really look at the true cost of this and base it on how poorly they estimated the cost in the 1996 bill, we are probably talking about a \$340 billion cost.

A \$340 billion bill, and we are trying to find more money for the Pell grants, the war on terrorism, homeland security, cancer research and biomedical research. We have a lot of needs for money, but we will spend \$340 billion on this.

Now, what this bill does is it encourages overproduction. Take the sugar program. We produce too much sugar because we have a program that encourages too much. Last year, the Fed-

eral Government bought \$430 million worth of sugar and we are storing it. We are storing it. And what we will do with this bill is encourage more production so we can store more sugar. And this is true with wheat, and corn, and cotton, and rice. All we are going to do is just produce more and more and store more and more, and the whole thing, in my opinion, will implode.

This hurts the small farmer. Eighty-eight percent of the money goes to the top 20 percent of the farmers. Bottom 80 percent, the smaller farmers, only get 12 percent of the money. So I encourage my colleagues to oppose this.

For liberals, it is good to oppose this because it costs the consumer more. It costs the consumer more. It is estimated at \$2,500 more per consumer. And the environmental organizations are all opposing this because it does not do enough for the environment.

For my conservatives, it should be a no-brainer. This just expands the role of Federal Government and makes people more dependent on the Federal Government.

And for everyone else, this is just bad economic policy. Because what we really should believe in this country is to give people more opportunity and freedom, rather than coming to Washington to beg for a check and creating yet another new entitlement program.

I think this has gone in the wrong direction, it is unfortunate, and I hope we can defeat the bill today.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

(Mr. ETHERIDGE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise today to urge my colleagues to support the conference report and support the rule for the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act crafted by the chairman and ranking member and those on the committee who did, I think, an excellent job in balancing the needs for agriculture.

The previous failure of the Freedom to Farm bill failed to live up to its promise of an adequate safety net for American farmers and, consequently, year after year Congress was asked to step in and provide billions of dollars. While this bill is not perfect, it goes a long way in meeting the needs. I will not go into the details, others will talk about that as we go on, but I am pleased this conference report does many of these things.

While there is much to like in this report, North Carolina growers can be especially pleased that it reaches out and does many of the things they need. However, we have to understand that compromise is the cornerstone of successful legislation, and no bill is perfect by everyone's standards.

Mr. Speaker, before I yield the floor, I would like to engage the chairman of

the Subcommittee on Specialty Crops and Foreign Agriculture Programs, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EVERETT), in a colloquy.

Traveling through North Carolina, the number 1 topic of discussion in tobacco communities is the growing support for reform in the current Federal tobacco quota system. Tobacco farmers want to eliminate quotas so they can grow their crops without paying rent to quota holders, thereby cutting the costs and making their product more competitive in the world market. Quota holders are willing to support such reform provided they are adequately and fairly compensated for the quotas they now own.

Several different approaches for revamping the program have been introduced, one by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE), the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL). There is another plan being drafted by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER), and many others will have one in. All have strengths and weaknesses.

□ 1030

Now that the work of the Committee on Agriculture on the farm bill is completed, can we expect the committee to turn its attention to the crop left behind, the tobacco program?

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ETHERIDGE. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) is a strong and tireless advocate for the tobacco growers of his State, and I understand his interest in the future of the tobacco program.

The reform of the tobacco program is something that deserves and requires a great deal of thought and debate. I look forward to holding hearings in my subcommittee on this topic. I know several members are interested in this issue, and I can assure the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) that the committee will take a hard and serious look at the Federal tobacco program later this year.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 2646, the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2001, and I commend the chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

This bill does help us increase clean energy. The bill is great for Minnesota agriculture and our many renewable energy sources. With six ethanol plants in my district, I am very familiar with ethanol. Ethanol is not only a domestic and renewable source of energy, it is

oxygen rich and, therefore, helps gas burn more completely, resulting in cleaner air for us to breathe.

Another source of renewable and domestic, home-grown energy is biodiesel, which can be derived from soybean oil which helps diesel oil burn cleaner. Both ethanol and biodiesel help generate jobs in rural communities, and expand demand for our farmers' products; and I am proud Minnesota has played a leadership role in both of these. I am a strong supporter of expanding both the use of ethanol and biodiesel.

Wind energy is also an important energy source in my district. The Buffalo Ridge in southwest Minnesota is one of the most ideal locations in the country for generating wind energy. Many windmills have already been constructed bringing both clean energy and alternative sources of revenue for area farmers. When it comes to alternative energy, these are exciting times in southwest Minnesota.

This farm bill includes many provisions that reward farmers and others for using renewable energy sources. Two provisions in the energy title award loans and loan guarantees to individuals and businesses that use renewable energy sources or make efficiency improvements.

One of the strongest provisions is the "Value-Added Agricultural Market Development Grants." These grants have been expanded to include wind power.

Mr. Speaker, although this bill is not perfect, it is a very good bill for clean energy and a great bill for Minnesota agriculture. I strongly support passage, and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), who has been a tremendous leader in a lot of these programs, especially in the school lunch program that the gentleman has pushed so successfully, along with the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule. I especially want to express my support for section 3107 of the conference report, the George McGovern-Robert Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program, which is included under title III of this bill.

The conference report establishes this global school feeding initiative as a permanent program and provides \$100 million for fiscal year 2003 to act as bridge money to sustain the current pilot program projects currently operating in 38 countries, currently feeding 9 million children, until continuing appropriations are made by Congress.

I want to thank the conferees who worked so hard to include this provision in the final conference report. I especially thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) for his work on this. I also thank the majority leader and the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and the ranking member from the other body for all their help,

and I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) for his hard work to make this provision a reality.

Mr. Speaker, the International Food for Education Program named after the two visionary Senators who developed this proposal, George McGovern and Robert Dole, aims to provide at least one nutritious meal each day in a school setting to more than 300 million children who go to bed at night hungry. Some 130 million of these children will not go to school this week because their parents need them to stay home or go to menial jobs, or because they are orphaned by war, natural disaster, or diseases like AIDS, or because they are girls.

School feeding programs are a proven method of reducing the incidence of hunger among children, attracting them to school, especially girls, and keeping them in school. When part of an integrated education strategy, they further contribute to improving academic performance.

In these perilous times, I firmly believe that the dollars we spend today on feeding and educating the neediest children around the world promote our national security, combat terrorism, and ultimately result in economic growth in new markets at home. Nine of today's top 10 importers of U.S. agricultural projects are former recipients of food aid. Today's hungry children, who get the chance to go to school and get a nutritious meal, will become tomorrow's teachers, doctors, computer programmers and entrepreneurs, the leaders of their nations.

I know that our farmers and our private voluntary and development organizations are proud to contribute to ending hunger, poverty and desperation through this type of program. I look forward to working with my colleagues and administration officials to make sure this program has adequate funding in the future. Again, I thank the conferees for their assistance with this.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD).

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, this farm bill is the product of months of hard work by the Committee on Agriculture colleagues, and it deserves our support, and I rise in strong support of the rule. I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) and the committee for coming to us with a bill that will help keep our family farmers operating across the country and will keep our supermarkets filled with fresh products at the best price.

In northeastern and central Pennsylvania, I have seen dairy farms disappear all my life. Farmers have had difficulty surviving the price fluctuations that can cripple their family income. I have made a priority to do something to help the small dairy farms in my region. The farms support not only the farmers that live on them, but they support the communities and the schools and the churches and the very rural infrastructure that has made our country great.

This bill, for the first time, gives us a counter-cyclical dairy payment which will be good for all producers. It is a national program which will provide a much-needed safety net for our farmers across America by providing direct payments in times of low prices. It is not a regional program. It is nationwide, and it will help all farmers. It will be immensely important to Pennsylvania's 10,000 dairy farmers.

This bill is good for consumers. It is good for producers. It is good for the rural areas of our country, and it is good for the environment. It keeps people on the land. It keeps the dairy farms spread out across the country, which is a great thing to have in times when we worry about bioterrorism and the things that have happened since September 11. This bill is good for America. I thank the conferees for coming back to us with much-needed help for the families and communities whose livelihoods depend upon dairy farming. I urge my colleagues to support this conference report.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this rule on the conference report. Overall this report represents a balanced bill that provides a good combination of safety net and flexibility. In so many ways, the Farm Security Act of 2002 is a renewed commitment to rural America at a time when it is needed.

As a member of the conference committee, I would like to offer my thanks to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM). I believe they provided the strongest leadership possible, and they negotiated a good bill for everyone. They were driven and tough, but yet they were understanding. Both of the gentlemen from Texas represented not only the interests of the House, but they also represented the best interests of American agriculture.

This bill is not perfect, and one of my disappointments is that we were not able to get a disaster provision in this bill. Members said there would be a point of order raised against it, so it was not possible; but we are going to continue to work to see if we can include it in the supplemental.

I am pleased with the dairy program where we have, for the first time, gotten everybody together. We have a national program that treats everybody the same that is going to be a big help when prices are low; and yet it is going to be the least disruptive to the marketplace. And, lastly, it is going to be focused on the smaller family farmers which are the ones that we are having a hard time keeping in business in this country.

We have provided some predictability with the commodity section, so with this 6-year bill, farmers are going to be able to update their bases and yields, have a target price, and have some

kind of understanding what kind of help is going to be available from the government during these times of low prices that are being caused by these trade agreements and the high value of the dollar.

On conservation, the Sportsman's Caucus and the others that I have worked with are very pleased with the conservation program where we are putting money into proven programs like CRP, WRP, WHIP, and other programs that have served us so well and have a backlog, and this is going to be very positive.

In the sugar area, I come from an area that is big in sugar production, and we are glad to have the predictability, and being able to get rid of the marketing assessment and putting in market allocations so we can manage this industry on a level playing field with the market.

Lastly, in the energy area, I represent an area that has a lot of ethanol, and we are now moving into biodiesel. This bill will give us some strong emphasis on resources, and resources to be placed on renewable energy. In the area of wind turbines and biomass, we are given greater latitude in conservation programs. And there is going to be a commitment to biodiesel, which is one of the exciting things we are going to be working. In Minnesota, the legislature just made a big commitment to biodiesel, and we are excited about getting this industry established.

This is a good bill for the country. It is a good bill for American agriculture. Again, I commend all of the members of the conference and the staff that worked so hard to put this together, and I encourage my colleagues to support the rule and the bill.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, we have a House rule that says we cannot debate the motion to recommit. There is going to be a motion to recommit this afternoon, so allow me to explain that motion to recommit now since we are not going to have a chance to talk about it when the motion is made by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

There are a lot of things good about this bill. Farmers need some help; but there are some bad things about this bill. One is the fact that there is a loophole where farmers, where the huge farmers, the megafarms, can receive millions of dollars in price support payments every year. The Senate put in the provision to include generic certificates as part of the total price support limit that any farmer can have.

We have a couple of States where many farmers exceed the limit and the lobbying has been tremendous. I have been receiving hundreds of calls saying we understand you are killing the farm

bill, and then I explain to them what the motion to recommit does, and then they say, is that all it does.

The only way this is going to kill the farm bill is if the chairman and the ranking member decide to take this back to committee and kill it themselves. Here is what the motion to recommit does: It is what we suggested in the motion to instruct on April 18 by a two-thirds vote when we instructed the conferees to include the provisions in the Senate bill that put an absolute payment limit on how much any farmer could get from price supports. The so-called loophole of generic certificates was included in the limit.

I think in the long run, it is going to hurt our farmers and our chances to have legitimate Federal farm policy that helps the average farmer. The loophole helps a couple of States, Texas, California, Arkansas and Mississippi, gain more from the generic certificates than almost all of the rest of the States put together.

□ 1045

There is a tremendous lobbying effort. Let us look at what is good policy, look at what is going to eventually help mainstream family farms in the United States. That is my request to this body. Vote for the motion to recommit.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I do identify with the comments of my colleague from Michigan, a family farmer who is focusing on the priority needs of agriculture in this country.

I look at this bill before us, and I argue against the bill; I argue against the rule. It is a lost opportunity for farmers, for people in my State, in Oregon, for conservation and water quality, and, most definitely, a lost opportunity for American taxpayers and consumers.

We are going to hear a lot of talk about conservation, and clearly conservation is a critical need for American agriculture. The rural-urban interface to protect farmland and their suburban neighbors is absolutely critical. Yet this bill struck important Senate provisions for conservation; and even though there is a huge increase in the dollar amount for agriculture, so large we do not know how much is going to be spent under this bill, at the end of the day, it devotes a smaller percentage for conservation than the 1996 bill.

It stripped out or watered down animal welfare provisions. This House approved provisions dealing with animal fighting, cockfighting. It reduced those penalties and delayed its implementation for a year.

Also dealing with downed animals. It is not a good bill in terms of animal welfare.

There are those, sadly, who think the only way you are going to help agriculture is to be able to pile more benefits on the very largest producers. They

ignore the fact that already there are almost 200,000 unmet applications for water conservation funding. These average only \$9,000 per payment. What they have done is to expand these programs to the very largest producers, further subsidize these large feedlot operations, increase the benefits to \$450,000 for years to come, and ignore being able to put more money to those who need it most.

It does little or nothing to deal with the needs of 80 percent of agriculture in my State and around the country, and it focuses on the largest elements.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, we are presented with the next 10 years of agricultural policy that comes down to this: huge increases in dollars, no one knows how much, and a lost opportunity to forge a program for the needs of agriculture for the next century.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON).

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Texas (Chairman COMBEST) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), for the excellent and diligent work they did on a most challenging bill.

I would like to just remind my colleagues to harken back to the 1996 Freedom to Farm bill and the fact that it was going to decrease subsidies, so to speak. But it was also based on three major components: number one, we would have lower taxes; number two, we would have fewer regulations; and, number three, we would have more markets in which to sell our commodities.

We all know Freedom to Farm did not work. We do not have fewer regulations; we have more. We do not have more markets; we have the same or fewer. And while no farmer wants to depend on the government for anything, it is critical that we provide a safety net to our producers.

I only wish that our colleagues who oppose this bill because of subsidies, and most of those folks I do want to say represent suburban districts, I wish that they would understand that in the United States we have a very cheap food policy. We spend 11 cents of every dollar on food, while in Europe they spend about 22 cents. In Russia they spend about 50 cents. We are very, very fortunate.

We have the safest, most abundant food supply anywhere in the world. I think that the conferees have done a remarkable job on this bill, given all of the challenges posed to them.

I do want to say one thing to our colleague from Oregon who said that we decrease funds for conservation. In fact, we increase funds by 80 percent. So that is incorrect.

Let me also take one moment to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for the steadfast commitment he has had and the work he has done on the Global Food for Education initiative. I greatly ap-

preciate that work he has done, as well as our conferees, in funding this very, very important initiative that will help poor children in countries go to school and also get the nourishment they need.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. It is important that we support it and certainly vote down any motion to recommit.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

(Mr. KIND asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Ohio for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the Committee on Agriculture, I know and truly appreciate how hard it is to form a consensus farm policy with so many different competing regions, experiences, different interests and ideas, in what should constitute the farm bill. You throw in an important election season, and it makes it very, very difficult. And I appreciate the work that has gone in from the leadership on the committee and the staff in particular. But this has not been about personalities, it has been about process and the policy; and unfortunately, it has been a bad process, and it has resulted in bad policy.

That is why later today at the end of general debate, I am going to be offering a motion to recommit with instructions based on a motion to instruct conferees that passed the House by 265 votes a little over 2 weeks ago. It would establish a meaningful payment limitation cap, consistent with the Senate language, of \$275,000, without exceptions, without loopholes.

Now, if you believe it is good farm policy for the next 10 years to continue to heap more and more taxpayer subsidies on a few but very large commodity producers in this country, then you probably should vote against my motion to recommit.

But if you believe, as I do, that we can do better, that we can produce a more fair and balanced farm bill that helps all our family farmers in all regions of the country, maintain fiscal discipline, and also maintain the opportunity for trade opportunities for our farmers, then I would encourage my colleagues to support the motion to recommit.

It is drafted clearly, very simply. The committee can adopt the language and report right back with the farm bill. This does not have to be a deal-killer; this does not have to ruin the ability to be able to provide a meaningful and balanced farm bill for all of our family farmers and to give them certainty in the upcoming planting season.

That is really what is at stake, in what direction we are going to go; whether we can have the courage to be consistent, where a majority of the Members of the House, a majority of the Senate are already on record of supporting a meaningful payment cap

of \$275,000; or if we are going to revert back to the old style farm policy. I encourage my colleagues to support the motion to recommit with instructions.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of the rule, but in opposition to the overall bill. I think we as Republicans in particular ought to worry about what we are doing here. In 1964 in a speech for Barry Goldwater, Ronald Reagan reminded us, he said: "There is no such thing as a left or a right, only an up or a down; up to the maximum of individual freedom consistent with order, or down to the ash heap of totalitarianism." He said: "Those who would trade freedom for security have already embarked on that downward course."

Now, what we did last week in the conference is we traded the Freedom to Farm Act for the Farm Security Act. I think we as Republicans ought to think twice about what we are doing here.

We hear a lot about the cheap food that we have in the U.S. Well, if you wonder why our food is so cheap, you have to realize part of the reason is because we are subsidizing it. It will cost the average American family over the next 10 years over \$1,800 in direct taxes simply because of subsidies to farm products. Do you want to know why products are cheap? It is because we are paying for it in other ways.

You have to also realize they should be cheaper. The average American family will pay \$2,500 in addition to the \$1,800 for a total of more than \$4,000 over the next 10 years, simply because of inflated food prices because of the price supports inherent in this bill.

We ought to wonder what we are doing. There is no such thing as a free lunch, and Americans across the country are being stuck with the bill.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY).

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time and rise in strong support of the rule and the underlying bill.

In reference to the remarks of the preceding speaker, let me just tell you that our Nation's farmers deserve more, much more, than to be pawns in some kind of ideological or partisan clash. That is why I so commend the leadership of the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture in bringing the bill before us today and the strong work they have done to craft a bill, get it passed and get it through the conference committee.

The bill restores a safety net for our Nation's farmers and sends a signal to them as they head into the fields this spring that we stand committed to family farmers as the primary element of the production of our Nation's food supply.

The bill restores a safety net for our Nation's farmers when prices collapse. No critical aspect of Freedom to Farm so failed our farmers as the failure to have a safety net price response. The bill makes that right.

The bill also increases conservation funding significantly, adds funding behind Market Value Development grants, and funds a Rural Strategic Investment program to help the financial health of our struggling rural communities, all of these very positive additions over present farm law.

It is a good bill, but it is not a perfect bill. I have to note some disappointments. The disaster assistance so badly needed by the farmers in my State, losses that were not compensated through the crop insurance program, were deleted from the bill. We have to make another run at finding another source to get that disaster funding put in place. Payment limitations should have been made more strict; they were not made more strict.

But I would respond to my colleagues that want to derail this bill today with their motion to recommit by saying at this point, I have got to part company with you. I support payment limits, but today is not the day to vote on that. We voted on it several times. Today is the day we put a farm program in place for our family farmers.

I believe if the program is derailed today, sent back to conference committee yet again, we will never get this in place for the upcoming crop year; and at this late point in time, that is the overarching priority, and that is why we ought to pass this legislation.

The bill is not the medicine that cures all that ails our farmers, but it is a good step forward; and I urge its passage.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the rule and the underlying bill. I represent a rural area. We lost 1,000 farmers last year, lost 5,000 over the last 6 years, and have the three poorest counties per capita in the United States. I have not seen Scottie Pippen out there, and some of those who have received \$200,000 payments broke even or lost money.

We are currently in the worst year of 5 years of record low prices. The European Union supports their farmers \$350 per acre, Japan well over \$1,000 per acre. We provide \$43 per acre, and we say that is too much. I do not understand that.

I would have liked to have maybe seen some tighter payment limits, maybe more restrictive rules on packer ownership. It is easy to throw rocks and cast stones and say I do not like this or like that, but I do not think most people realize how difficult it is to coordinate all of the different agricultural regions in the country and to write a comprehensive bill.

Somebody earlier complained about the process. This thing went on over 2 years, 47 hearings. It was done in the full committee. The ranking member and the chairman could not have been more fair. Everybody had their shot. There was nothing done behind closed doors. It could not have been a better process.

So what the bill does is this: it eliminates emergency payments. The last 4 years we have spent \$24 billion a year on agriculture with emergency payments. This bill should average \$17 billion a year. That is not throwing money away, as far as I am concerned; that is fiscally responsible.

The 80 percent increase in conservation certainly does not ignore conservation interests. That is a huge increase. We have significant increases for research, 350 percent for agriculture research, and promotion of foreign trade, nutrition, rural economic development, which we badly need, and we also have some renewable fuel economies.

So if this bill is rejected, we will start over in the middle of an election cycle, and we will make the 1,370-page bill that the other body presented us look very small in comparison. I urge support of the rule and passage of the bill.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON).

□ 1100

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the rule and the farm bill conference report.

Farmers throughout the 23 counties of Missouri's Fourth Congressional District have been facing some of the lowest crop prices in a generation. The 1998 Freedom to Farm Act was adopted when times were pretty good and with the notion of providing more flexibility for our agriculture producers. Unfortunately, it did not provide an adequate safety net and it failed to yield the tools we need to address hard times like the current farm recession. Consequently, since 1998, Congress has approved billions of dollars in ad hoc farm income assistance.

In contrast, this year's farm bill provides a meaningful safety net for America's agriculture producers and gives certainty and support to farmers who might otherwise be forced to leave farming.

The bill is comprehensive. It is a 6-year measure that covers subsidies to producers, conservation, food safety, nutrition and trade. For commodities, it continues the direct payment program in marketing loans, but also adds a countercyclical initiative that would make payments when farm prices are so low. Importantly, the bill also undertakes price supports for dairy farmers and increased funding for apple producers.

The farm bill expands USDA's conservation programs, including helpful funding for the Environmental Quality

Initiative Program so that Missouri's farmers can address conservation problems and comply with expensive, but important, environmental regulations. It also extends and improves the food stamp program and other nutrition initiatives while renewing our emphasis on rural development, agriculture research and energy, including language that reauthorizes and funds both biomass and biodiesel initiatives.

Mr. Speaker, the farm bill is long overdue, and I commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) and their counterparts from the other body in working together on behalf of America's farmers.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I rise in support of the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to this debate and I cannot help but just think about how much we take for granted here in the United States, how spoiled we are. We take our farmers for granted every single day.

We take for granted that we have the cheapest food in the world. When there is any kind of an emergency in the world, who does the world turn to first? The American farmer. In fact, literally, before we had troops on the ground in Afghanistan, we were putting together food supplies to make certain that the folks in Afghanistan did not starve to death. That is true in every hot spot in the world. American farmers are taken for granted.

Mr. Speaker, there is something else we take for granted. Here is a chart. This is how much we pay for food in the United States as a percentage of the per capita income. It is only 10.9 percent here in the United States. We take that for granted every single day that we will have an abundance of cheap food on every supermarket counter all across the country.

For example, in India, it is 51 percent. Even some of our close friends like the United Kingdom, it is 11.2; Sweden, 14.6; in France, it is 14.8. We take that for granted every single day. We take so much for granted.

I hear this debate and people say, oh, my gosh, we are going to spend \$73.5 billion over the next 10 years. Well, that is what we agreed to last year. That is what we formally agreed to this year in our budget resolution. It should not come as a surprise. The gentleman from Nebraska recently said we had 47 hearings on this. We went all over the country. We learned a lot about agriculture, whether one is in California or Pennsylvania or down South, in the upper Midwest, and this is a wonderful compromise.

I want to congratulate the ranking member and the chairman. Frankly, I think when this thing is all over we ought to send them to the Middle East to try to bring these people together to

come up with a compromise that people can live with, which is almost impossible.

As I say, there are 2 things that we take for granted in this country every single day. One is cheap food and the other, I think, is even more important, and that is an unlimited supply of young farmers who are willing to go out there and take a chance at it. We take that for granted every day. I think part of the reason we ought to pass this bill today is because we need to send a message to younger farmers that when we do things here at the Federal level that make it difficult for farmers to compete in the world marketplace, we ought to be there to provide a shock absorber, and when we send that message, we are going to have those young farmers out there willing to take a chance at it.

Let me show my colleagues the second chart. Some people say we are spending too much on farmers. Well, even with the passage of this bill, the old number was \$49 per acre that we subsidize agriculture, and with the passage of this bill it will go to \$54 an acre. Yes, that is a lot of money. But when we compare it to our trading competitors, the European Union is \$309 per acre, and in Japan it is over \$4,000 an acre.

Now, we are asking our farmers to compete in that world marketplace. What about leveling the playing field?

Finally, some people say we need payment limits, and I am in favor of payment limits. But understand that farming is changing. So when we look at these numbers, they look like big numbers, but if one is a full-time farmer, some people say, well, 80 percent of the benefit will go to 20 percent of the farmers. That is the farmers who produce the food for us and the rest of the world. I think we need to pass this today.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of the rule and in support of the legislation.

As others have indicated, when we put together a bill of such magnitude, of so many commodities, of so many different parts of the country, it is difficult stuff and, at the end of the day, nobody is going to be 100 percent happy, but this is basically a good bill, and I applaud the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) and I applaud the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) for their efforts.

To my mind, the great crisis facing this country in terms of agriculture is that every single day we are seeing family farmers being forced off the land, people who, in some instances, have been, their families have been on that land generation after generation after generation. This is true in my State of Vermont, it is true in the Midwest, it is true in the South, it is true all over this country.

Some people say, well, what is the big deal? So what. Let the market work. So what if we end up with 3 companies who control the production and distribution of food in America? I say that is not good. I say that will be a disaster for the consumer. Think about what food prices will be when we have a few agribusiness companies controlling what we eat and the prices that we pay. Think about what it means to the environment when family farmers all over this country are forced off the land and shopping malls and parking lots take their place. What does that mean for suburban sprawl?

Think about food security for the United States of America. Every Member of this body is concerned about our dependence on Mideast oil. What will it mean when we are forced to import food to feed our people?

Vermont is a dairy State. We brought forth the North East Dairy Compact which protects New England and I thought and believe today that was good legislation. Other people in this body disagreed with that. What made sense for us was to work with our friends in the Midwest, work with our friends in the South, and say let us develop national dairy policy which protects farmers not only in the Northeast, but in the Mid-Atlantic, in the South, in the Midwest. I am proud that we were able to craft legislation that will give strong protection to dairy farmers, family farmers all over this country.

I want to thank all of the representatives from the Midwest, from the South, for their help in that effort.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS).

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Let me start off by thanking the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM). I know a lot of people have started off by saying that today, but I just want to tell my colleagues, having worked very closely with these gentlemen for the last 10 weeks and particularly over the last 2 years, 2½ years, almost, now, to construct this farm bill, these men have done yeoman work for the American farmer and they deserve every bit of the congratulations they are getting today.

Let me tell my colleagues how this farm bill came about. Two years ago the chairman decided that we wanted to approach the new farm bill a little bit different than we had approached any other farm bill. We went all across America. We held 10 hearings around the country. We did not talk to commodity groups and we did not talk to commissioners of agriculture; we talked to farmers. We said what is working with the current farm bill? What do you want to see maintained out of that farm bill? And what do you

want to see, what type of different approach do you want to see?

Based on what we heard from farmers, the chairman and the ranking member came back, along with all of us who attended those hearings, and again, those of us who did our own hearings. I did a hearing in my subcommittee on the West Coast and the Midwest rural agriculture area and one on the East Coast, again, talking to farmers. We developed a philosophy that is entirely different from the approach in the current farm bill that we are operating under, but it is an approach that will allow our farmers to get a decent return on the investment they make every year.

Most people in America do not understand that every farmer in America gambles his life savings every single year when he turns the ground and puts seeds in the ground and fertilizer on top of it and hopes that at the end of the day, he is going to be able to get some kind of return on that investment that he has had to make.

This farm bill, irrespective of what crop it is, guarantees that our farmers will have an opportunity to plan right, to use good, sound business decisions to be able to get a decent return on their investment.

There has been a lot said about payment limits up here. Well, I am one of those States that is criticized for the high payment limits that our farmers have. Let me tell my colleagues what that means to my farmers. My farmers would just as soon not get one dime from the Federal Government. They would much rather rely on the market. But the simple fact of the matter is that prices today for commodities that my farmers grow and every farmer across America grows are lower than what they were or equal to what they were almost 50 years ago. But yet the cost of a tractor, the cost of a combine, the cost of a cotton picker, the cost of chemicals, the cost of fertilizer, have skyrocketed.

Our farmers deserve a break. Our farmers deserve to have an investment made in them so that every single individual who goes to the store or goes to the grocery store or the department store to buy food products or shirts or suits or whatever they may be can be assured that they are going to get a quality product at a reasonable price. We have seen the numbers up here about how much money the average individual in America spends on food products compared to what people spend around the world. The reason that is so is because of the investment the government makes under this payment limitation provision.

Let us support this rule, let us support the underlying bill and, most importantly, let us support the American farmer.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I represent the most productive agricultural congressional district in the United States, not only in production, but in diversity of crops, and I go home every week and I talk to my farmers and they ask me, when is somebody going to get up and say that these farm bills really do not protect farmers? I have heard a lot of discussion here today.

What this protects is farmers if they grow those crops in your district or in your State, but the majority of people out there who are planting the seeds that the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) talked about do not benefit from that program. They go to market and if the market price is low, they have to eat it. If the crop fails, they have to eat it. They do not get help from the Government. I think that the problem with the farm bill is it states for the next 5 years what our U.S. policy, and U.S. policy about agriculture is that if you are in a special commodity program, the Government is going to help you. If you are outside of it, you just have to take the risk and bear it.

Until we get a farm bill that is fair to everyone and fair to totality, the holistic approach to our community, to land use, to animal husbandry, to humane practices and to making it fair for every farmer in America, we are not going to have a good farm bill. I urge a no vote.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE).

(Mr. GANSKE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I am for the rule, but after listening to and learning from many of Iowa's leading farmers, I will vote against this farm bill conference report. It is fair to say that many farmers in Iowa have deep reservations about this bill. This farm bill conference report is not in the Nation's or my State's best long term interest. We need to go back to the drawing board. This bill fails in many ways.

The conference payment limitations provision is a sham. The Grassley proposal would have brought the limit down to \$275,000 and have eliminated the 3-entity rule. The conference report favors the large southern producers of cotton and rice and is so full of loopholes that it does not even qualify as a step forward.

For instance, a 25,000-acre cotton farm could receive as much as \$8.4 million in total annual payments because of loopholes. In 2000 and 2001, 85 percent of the 2 billion certificates went to farmers in large agribusinesses in just 4 States: Arkansas, Mississippi, Texas and California. Riceland Foods of Arkansas alone collected \$221 million, and that continues under this bill.

The Grassley proposal for a ban on the packer ownership of livestock was endorsed by the Iowa Farm Bureau, the Iowa Pork Producers, the Iowa Cattleman's Association, the Iowa Farmers

Union and the National Farmers Union. It is not usual for all of these groups to agree on farm policy, but on this they were unanimous, and the conference completely ignored this important issue.

Some aspects of this bill remind me of a return to the failed farm policies of the 1980s and early 1990s. Because it is tilted so heavily to agriculture in the South, it will encourage production in marginal areas with high crop failure rates. This will keep commodity production higher than it would be under free market conditions.

□ 1115

It is in the Nation's interest in terms of conservation to take marginal land out of production. CRP helps, but it will be buried by the push in this bill for higher production for marginal lands, and that will lower prices even further.

Mr. Speaker, we can do better than this conference report, and we should.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN).

(Mr. ACKERMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly rise in opposition. After a decade of work, I had been tremendously pleased to see that my amendment to ban the marketing and movement of downed animals at auctions in stockyards was included and accepted by the House, and I am disappointed today that this commonsense legislation to protect the safety of the food supply and to end the suffering of downed animals was neutered by the conference.

The transport and marketing of these incapacitated, sick, and crippled animals creates a tremendous human health concern, as well as humane concerns. This is only one-tenth of 1 percent of the market, and they are not euthanized only because at that point they could not be used for human consumption.

The downed animal amendment has 165 sponsors, was accepted by both Houses. The House should know that meat from downed animals has an increased risk from bacterial contamination and other diseases, including neurological afflictions such as mad cow disease. The Veterinary Services Department of the USDA itself said that downed animals is the number two risk for mad cow disease.

We have prohibited the use of this product in the school lunch program; McDonald's, Burger King, Wendy's have banned the use of this. California bans the use of this. How on earth do we justify using the meat of these poor downed, crippled, sick animals in our own food supply?

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Farm Security Act Conference Report. After over a decade of work, I was tremendously pleased to see that my amendment to ban the marketing and movement of "downed ani-

mals" at auctions and stockyards and to require that these animals be humanely euthanized was included in both the House and the Senate version of the Farm Security Act.

Today I am disappointed to report that this commonsense legislation to protect the safety of our Nation's food supply, and to end the suffering of downed animals was severely neutered during conference committee negotiations.

The transport and marketing of these incapacitated sick or crippled animals creates tremendous human health concerns as well as humane concerns. Downers make up only one-tenth of 1 percent of the market. And not to euthanize them just because then they couldn't be marketed for human consumption, is indeed a sin.

The downed animal amendment cosponsored by 165 members, was accepted by the House and the Senate and offered a solution that would protect both the public health and downed animals.

Meat from downed animals has an increased risk for bacterial contamination and other diseases, including neurological afflictions such as mad cow disease. This is not a fringe idea.

Last year, the USDA itself instituted a policy precluding the purchase of beef from downed animals for the national school lunch program because of these safety concerns.

How on God's Earth can they justify marketing this to the rest of the country, when they say it is unsafe to put in our school lunch program?

In addition to this, the fast food chains are doing the appropriate thing. Chains such as McDonald's and Burger King and Wendy's have all banned the use of meat from downed animals in their products. And who else? California, the largest cattle producer in the country, Colorado and Illinois, have already prohibited the entry of downed animals into the food supply. Why just them? All Americans must be protected from this risk.

And yet, and yet, there are some who kowtow to the few irresponsible folks within the industry in order to protect only one-tenth of 1 percent of the market.

Last year a Zogby America Poll of 1,000 people in our country found that four out of every five opposed the use of downed animals for human food.

I want to emphasize that my downed animal amendment passed both bodies; it has 165 cosponsors; and that it gives USDA the authority it needs and does not interfere with the USDA's current disease-testing program.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I support the rule and I support the bill. The bill is not a perfect bill, but there is no perfect piece of legislation that I have ever seen pass the Congress or pass the House of Representatives.

But this is an important piece of legislation. It is not only an important piece of legislation for farmers, but for hungry people as well, and also for us as consumers. It affects millions and millions of people, and I think what the gentleman from Texas (Chairman

COMBEST) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), have done, and their staffs, everybody who has worked on this, is a tremendous task.

They are to be congratulated for all the different provisions that they put in there: for nutrition, for legal immigrants, for hungry people overseas, the TFAB program. So many programs that are important are incorporated in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we are able to pass this legislation. I see no reason why we cannot.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST), the chairman of the Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I simply want to thank the Committee on Rules for their warm acceptance of our testimony yesterday before them, for granting this rule, and for the kind words of support that have been indicated by the members of the Committee and others.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 403, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2646) to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2011.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of May 1, 2002, at page H1795).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) each will control 30 minutes.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) opposed to the bill?

Mr. STENHOLM. I most certainly am not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST).

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, before I get into the discussion of the heart of this bill, I want to take a moment to thank my friend

and my colleague, the ranking member on the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Two-and-a-half years ago, we literally linked arm in arm to try to move down a path of finding an answer to what had been plaguing the agricultural economy in America for a number of years, and we have seen it continue to exist and grow. This was done in a strongly bipartisan manner. We included all of our committee.

We went across this country and had hearings and listened to people tell us what their concerns were. We have heard and we will hear throughout this day opposition by people who, certainly their opposition in their mind is as justified as it is part of our process.

But I would say that looking at this in total and in whole, and looking at this from the standpoint of where we are if this conference report does not pass, I would say that to anyone who has a true care about agriculture and rural development and rural America and nutrition and conservation and research and trade, that there is no other option. It is either basically this or it is nothing.

I want to thank my friend for those long plane rides and those long hearings, for those hours of discussion that we moved through together. Because without that effort and without that opportunity, I do not believe that we would be where we are today. So I thank my friend.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the conference report on the farm bill. This is the end product of over 2 years of very hard work by members of the Committee on Agriculture. After dozens of hearings in Washington and around the country, and hundreds of hours of work, we brought a farm bill to the floor last October that passed this House with 291 votes. We went into a difficult conference over 60 days ago, and after a great deal of effort and compromise, we produced the conference report that Members will have before them today.

Because we could not finish a bill last year, the time needed to put in place a new farm bill for this crop year is almost gone. If the House does not pass this conference report today, there will be no strengthened safety net for farmers this year. Instead, the House will be faced with passing a fifth temporary emergency spending bill for farmers.

Both farmers and taxpayers are shortchanged by slapping Band-Aids on the problem of the farm economy. Farmers are facing the fifth year of record low prices, and the lowest real net cash income since the Great Depression. As a result, Congress has spent nearly \$30 billion over the last 4 years in emergency assistance.

While desperately needed, these ad hoc payments always left producers and their lenders in a state of uncertainty. There was no ability to use this money efficiently.

One of the primary reasons for acting quickly on the farm bill was to end de-

pendence on the ad hoc legislation. The conference report we have before us provides better, more flexible help for farmers. While the emergency bill averaged \$7 billion per year, this farm bill, according to its scoring, averages less than \$5 billion a year in additional spending to help farmers.

Clearly, putting in place an improved farm bill, beginning with this crop year, is better for everyone. But we have reached in the 11th hour. In a matter of days it will be too late to implement an improved program for this year. Congress will then be left with the option of yet another emergency spending and the job of redrafting a farm bill.

I want to emphasize to my colleagues that today's conference report is the best compromise we are likely to see. In addition to desperately needed help for farmers, it contains the largest single increase in conservation funding in history, significant gains for food stamps and nutrition funding, more resources for agricultural research, increased incentives for renewable fuels production, and a strengthened commitment to our rural communities. It is all accomplished within the limits of the budget.

Failure to act decisively today to secure the gains in this conference report would jeopardize the future of our farmers and all of the others who benefit from this work that went into the farm bill. This bill is supported by dozens of farm groups, ranging from the Farm Bureau to the Farmers Union to the Food Research Action Center to Ducks, Unlimited.

Yesterday, the Secretary of Agriculture said she would recommend the President sign the legislation. Today we have a statement from the President commending this legislation. They all know that this conference report benefits everyone.

Mr. Speaker, let us not pass up the opportunity to help American agriculture and rural communities. I would strongly urge my colleagues to support this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes to briefly summarize where we are.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this conference report. I, too, want to begin by congratulating my friend, my neighbor, and the chairman of my committee for his work and action over the last 2½ years. His leadership has been exemplary, and for that, I am very appreciative.

Speaking from the minority side, from the very beginning, the hearings that we held all over the country in which we asked for solutions when bringing the bill to the full floor of the House, after full deliberations in the committee in which every minority interest was heard, as well as every majority interest, and then coming to the floor of the House and having the full discussion under an open rule in which

every Member of this body was permitted to have their say, and now, the last 4 weeks, in a very difficult conference with the other body, Mr. Chairman, the chairman's leadership has brought it to this point. I am proud to have ridden shotgun with the gentleman in this endeavor.

Now we have urgency before us. It is time to report this bill out of the House, out of the Senate, and get it to the President, where he will sign it, as he has said today.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report is well-balanced. It restores the safety net for producers, it boosts spending on farm conservation programs by over 80 percent, it restores food stamps to immigrant children and the disabled, it addresses critical needs in rural development, and it tightens payments limits, and it is fiscally responsible.

We have stayed within the \$73.5 billion that the Committee on the Budget gave us. As we have already heard from several speakers, if we really want to be fiscally responsible, we will pass this bill. We will not continue to depend upon emergency ad hoc spending, which has, as we have just heard, has been \$30 billion over the last 4 years.

This bill is fiscally responsible. It does most of the things, even though it cannot please all of us. There are still those on the Committee on Agriculture and in this body that do not agree with everything that we have done, but I commend this as a reasonable compromise.

Mr. Speaker, I am in strong support of the conference report and oppose any motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all of my colleagues for the debate we have had. House consideration under an open rule resulted in passage of the bill by a vote of 291 to 120. After the Senate debated the bill for weeks, we had conferees from 10 House committees and the Senate come to agreement on the conference report that is before the House today.

Mr. Speaker, I particularly congratulate the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, my friend and neighbor, LARRY COMBEST. His leadership from the beginning has been outstanding. Under his guidance the Agriculture Committee, the full House, and finally the conference committee developed a refined farm bill that brings together a wide variety of interests.

Mr. Speaker, we need to pass this conference report without delay. It has been several years since we could say that things were going well in American agriculture.

Right now, corn is valued at under \$2 per bushel, wheat—about \$2.75; soy beans—about \$4.60; and cotton is under 35 cents a pound. Our ability to export is hampered by an unfavorable exchange rate. The bottom line: Our producers need this farm bill.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report is a well-balanced package: It restores the safety net for agricultural procedures; it boosts spending on Farm Conservation programs by over 80 percent; it restores food stamps to immigrant children and disabled; it addresses critical needs in rural development; and it tightens payment limits.

Mr. Speaker, I know that many of my colleagues wish there was more in this conference report. So do I. I know there are colleagues who wish that some provisions were not included in this conference report. So do I. But we had to compromise and respect the views of our colleagues from the other body. The bill is not perfect, but it will do a great deal of good for our Nation. Agricultural producers will have greater financial security, hungry people will be fed, and natural resources will be protected and preserved.

Mr. Speaker, all of my colleagues should be clear about this. Regardless of the instructions, a motion to recommit will kill this conference report and everything in it.

I ask my colleagues to vote "no" on any motion to recommit and vote yes on the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report. We have brought to the House a well-balanced bill, and I believe that a strong vote for its adoption will demonstrate the House's agreement. I want to thank my colleagues in the House for their cooperation and assistance in bringing this bill forward. My colleagues on the Agriculture Committee, on both sides of the aisle, deserve a great deal of credit for their willingness to get the farm bill off to a good start last July. Since then, it has sometimes gone slowly but we have persevered and can be gratified with the final result.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to thank all of my colleagues who served on the conference committee, including those from the nine committees other than the Agriculture Committee. The broad support of the conferees who signed the report is another testament to the balanced and inclusive approach that was taken to develop this important legislation.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I must take a moment to congratulate the Chairman of the Agriculture Committee, my friend and neighbor, LARRY COMBEST. His leadership from the beginning has been outstanding. Under his guidance, the Agriculture Committee, the full House, and finally the conference committee developed a refined farm bill that brings together a wide variety of interests.

Mr. Speaker, on October 5 of last year, after a full debate under an open rule, this House passed the farm bill by a strong bipartisan vote of 291 to 120. On February 13, the Senate passed its version by a vote of 58 to 40, after weeks of floor consideration. Following Senate passage, conferees from the Agriculture Committees—and nine other House committees—have worked daily to develop the compromise that is before the House today. As we usually see with conference reports on important issues, no one involved is completely happy with the final result. It is a truly balanced package, however, and there are many reasons to support swift passage of this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report before the House has many features. First and foremost, it provides for a strong safety net for our Agricultural producers. The bill retains the flexibility in production and reliability of decoupled assistance that were provided for in the 1996 Farm Act. Above and beyond that, the countercyclical payments it provides to program crop producers will alleviate the need for Congress to provide additional, ad hoc, income support when prices are in decline. Marketing loan tools will continue to be available to program crop producers.

Mr. Speaker, farm program support will be governed by new payment limit provisions. The conference compromise reduces the limit on fixed payments by 20 percent: the limit on countercyclical payments—in comparison to the House bill—are reduced 13 percent, and loan deficiency payments and marketing loan gains are cut in half. The total dollar limitation on program assistance under the conference compromise is reduced by 35 percent in comparison to the House bill. We have maintained the ability of producers to use generic certificates in order to continue to support them in these times of very low prices. New transparency rules regarding payment provisions are being included, allowing us to gather information in order to provide a clearer view of the distribution of program payments.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report extends the dairy price support program through 2007, and restores the program's budgetary baseline. In addition, the conferees propose a modification of the Senate's direct dairy payment program. Under the provision, a countercyclical payment will be made to dairy producers for any month during which the class I price for Boston under Federal milk marketing orders is lower than \$16.94. A participating producer would be eligible for payment on all production up to 2.4 million pounds per year. While some Members will oppose any direct payments to dairy farmers, the conference has substantially improved the program in comparison to the Senate's provision. This is a temporary program that will help ease the sting of the loss of the Northeast Dairy Compact—which is not extended by the bill—for dairy farmers in the Northeast. It also provides fair support to producers throughout the Nation when milk prices fall.

Mr. Speaker, the conference substitute follows the House bill by ending the quota program for peanuts. Under this dramatic reform, peanut quota will be retired, and producers will become eligible for the types of marketing loan, countercyclical, and fixed payment benefits that apply to program crops.

The bill extends the sugar program and provides needed support for sheep and goat ranchers, as well as for beekeepers.

Mr. Speaker, the conference compromise also provides for extension of chapter 12—Small Family Farmer Bankruptcy provisions. The chapter will be extended to run until December 31, 2002.

The conference report provides for truly dramatic increases in spending on farm conservation programs. I know that many of my colleagues are hearing from one organization or another that the report falls short in this area. Sometimes those folks attempt to make their case without providing the facts. Here are the facts, based on the actual provisions of the conference report:

\$17.1 billion is added to farm conservation programs over 10 years. This bill is an 80 percent increase in farm conservation spending.

Conservation Reserve Program acreage will rise from 36.4 to 39.2 million acres.

The Wetlands Reserve Program acreage cap rises from 975,000 acres to 2.275 million acres.

New Grasslands Reserve Program to protect 2 million acres.

Farmland Protection Program—A 20-fold increase.

Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program—A 10-fold increase.

EQIP—Annual spending will rise to \$1.3 billion, compared to \$200 million under current law.

New Conservation Security Program to provide incentive payments for stewardship on working farms.

Mr. Speaker, the bill also allocates additional resources for nutrition program spending. In solidarity with the Bush administration, we propose to restore food stamp benefits for immigrant children and for disabled immigrants, as well as for immigrants who have been in the country for 5 years. Transitional benefits are provided for households leaving the TANF program, Temporary Assistance to Needy Families. As a result of this legislation, the food stamp quality control system is reformed and procedures are aligned with other welfare programs. The Emergency Food Assistance Program and other feeding programs are extended and expanded under the provisions of the bill. Altogether, nutrition program spending is increased by \$6.4 billion above baseline levels.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the programs I have mentioned, funding is provided to reduce backlogs in the rural water and waste programs, to reaffirm our commitment to helping farmers compete for foreign markets, to boost research on agricultural production, and to continue the Global Food for Education Initiative, GFEI.

The conference report also establishes a requirement that food labels identify the country of origin of meat, fruits and vegetables, fish, and peanuts. The Secretary must provide guidelines for voluntary labeling by September 30, 2002, and the program would become mandatory in 2 years. There are many concerns that have been raised by the affected parties regarding the implementation of country of origin labeling. I want to assure everyone interested in this issue that the committee intends to closely monitor the establishment of this program and to fine tune it as necessary before the final mandatory program becomes effective.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I need to speak to the budget aspect of this legislation. I must admit, it greatly disturbs me to come to this floor and support a conference report with \$73.5B in spending, given our current projections on deficit spending. However, when I sit down and try to analyze a better solution, I can find none. When I look at our past actions on disaster and income assistance, I quickly come to the conclusion that the only way we can avoid more costly year-by-year assistance to agriculture is to provide a reliable long term agricultural policy that includes a programmatic response to low prices as well as disasters. I believe that this bill will save money in the long run because it lessens our need to rely on disaster and income assistance.

Mr. Speaker, I know that many of my colleagues wish there was more in this conference report. So do I. I know there are colleagues who wish that some provisions were not included in this conference report. So do I. But we had to compromise and respect the views of our colleagues from the other body. The bill is not perfect, but it will do a great deal of good for our Nation. Agricultural producers will have greater financial security, hungry people will be fed, and natural resources will be protected and preserved.

I strongly urge my colleagues to embrace these objectives and to vote for the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today very, very reluctantly to oppose this bill. I have worked very closely with the chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) over the course of the last several years trying to craft a sensible farm policy.

I do want to congratulate them for all of their hard work, their tenacity, and their ability to produce a bill in a very difficult political environment.

But maybe it was the political environment itself that causes us to be here. We have a closely divided Congress, we have big elections in November, and as a result, trying to do good sound farm policy in the midst of this frankly is almost impossible.

But they have, in fact, produced a bill that they are very proud of, and I am very proud of them for bringing a bill out.

□ 1130

But in the end we have to make decisions as Members of Congress about whether it is the right policy. And as I look at the bill that we have before us, I stand to reluctantly oppose it. And I do so for a number of reasons, but at this point I would like to talk about the overall and overriding reason why I am in opposition to the bill.

For 60 years in America we put a hand, a lid, over the abilities of farmers' opportunity to succeed, all in an effort to be helpful to them. We had a system of loan rates and price guarantee, acreage reduction; and we did it from 1935 until 1996. Farmers did not have a chance at succeeding because we always had the lid over the top of the commodity prices, never gave them a chance to succeed. In 1996, we made a break from that policy and we went to Freedom to Farm. It worked well for a couple of years, but then when we had the Southeast Asian problem, prices began to collapse. We had the strength of the dollar that also inhibited our ability to export products around the world.

Then in a closely divided Congress fighting for control in the House and the Senate, got into a bidding war as to who could be the biggest friend of agriculture. And over the last few years we have had generous, very generous, emergency payments. But instead of staying the course and trying to allow farmers the opportunity to get their income from the market where farmers want to get their income, what we are doing is we are going back to what we know did not work for 60 years; and that is because the loan rates in the bill that we have before us and the target prices that we have will in fact drive more production. It will bring

more marginal lands into production because of these high loan rates that will further decrease the commodity prices that we have today.

And what happens then? We expose the taxpayer to pick up the difference between those low commodity prices and the loan rates that we are setting. Farmers will have no chance to succeed, no chance of letting the marketplace ever work; and as a result small farmers are going to continue to go by in the way of a dust storm and only the biggest and strongest producers who frankly do not need this help will be getting most of the help.

I do not think that is what we want to do. I just think that American agriculture does in fact want the market to work. Farmers do not want checks from the Federal Government; they want them from the market place. But in my view of the bill we have before us, ask where it will lead us over the next several years. We will in fact see a collapse of commodity prices and as a result the 10 years' number of an additional \$73.5 billion will in fact get eaten up in my view rather quickly over the next couple of years. And then we will have a real disaster on our hands. So my opposition to the bill is to say let us fix it now before we get ourselves into a box where we have excess products laying all over the country, very low prices and huge government expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), chairman of the Subcommittee on Conservation, Credit, Rural Development and Research of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the farm bill. Today, I believe, is a great day for America's farmers and for rural America. This bill shows the true commitment of Congress to the future of production agriculture. I am proud to have been a part of a process where we actually asked producers what they wanted to see in the next farm bill. Farmers told us they like the flexibility and the fixed payment system of the old farm bill, but there was a key element missing: producers wanted a safety net, and we responded by including a safety net in this bill.

Producers asked us to give them an option of receiving an LDP payment on wheat they grazed out. It was decided that that was the more economical thing to do than harvest it. This bill gives the producers that option and allows them to make decisions that are best for their operation.

Producers told us that the current conservation programs were working. The only problem was there was not enough funding. We responded by increasing the funding for conservation programs by 80 percent and the basic cost-share conservation program by six times. Producers pushed Congress to include a country-of-origin labeling

and their work paid off. When given this option, I believe consumers will pick American produce over our foreign competitors. I strongly support this farm bill. I urge my colleagues to vote for final passage and show their support for America's farmers.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN), who has been a valued member of the conference that helped us bring us to this point.

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference, report and I want to congratulate and commend the chairman and the ranking member for their hard work and determination in bringing this regionally balanced piece of legislation to the floor.

I ask all of my colleagues to support this legislation, but I particularly want to urge my Pennsylvania and the Northeastern and Mid-Atlantic State Members to support this conference report. Historically, we have felt left behind when it comes to USDA policy, but this conference report changes that. We have a true safety net for our dairy farmers. Agriculture is still the number one industry in Pennsylvania, and certainly dairy is the most significant form of agriculture in Pennsylvania.

What we have here is a safety net that protects the first 2.4 million pounds of production. That will cover herds of up to 135 cows. That will overwhelmingly cover the majority of milk produced in Pennsylvania. We heard talk of an 80 percent increase in conservation in this conference report. That is so important in Pennsylvania. We have almost a billion dollars in this conference report for farm land conservation. Pennsylvania has already retired 194,000 acres in the Farm Land Protection Program. This will allow us to continue the fight to protect against urban sprawl and to keep our family farmers in business.

Rural development. We have over a billion dollars in rural development investment in this conference report; 360 million of that is directed towards the backlog in water and sewer projects. That is so desperately needed in the Northeastern part of the country, something that has also been very valuable in Pennsylvania as we attempt to clean up our streams and rivers and watersheds.

Again, I want to commend the chairman and the ranking member and all the conferees and everyone who has worked very hard on this legislation. It is balanced, and it is good for American agriculture.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EVERETT).

(Mr. EVERETT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill. It is good for the American farmer, and it is good for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. farm economy continues to experience one of the worst cycles of depressed prices for most of the major commodities, while the costs continue to escalate for major inputs. Our farmers and ranchers have been without a safety net to protect them during periods of low market prices. Fortunately, we are about to change that with this new farm bill. We began this process over two years ago with field hearings around the country to hear from producers about what they wanted to see in a new farm bill. I am happy to say that much of what we heard from producers is represented today in this farm bill, The Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002.

I am confident the safety net provided to producers by this bill will insure they remain competitive and viable, even in times of depressed prices. A strong, effective farm policy is essential if our producers are to continue to provide us with the safest, most affordable, and most abundant food and fiber supply in the world. While our producers are some of the most efficient in the world, they have been forced to compete on an unlevel playing field, but I believe this bill will help to level that field.

It has been a long process before arriving at this point, but I believe we have produced a bill that will benefit all farmers, ranchers, and rural communities across America. In addition to the strong safety net this bill provides for producers, it contains conservation programs that represent an eighty percent increase in spending for conservation. There are also improved trade, nutrition, credit, research, and forestry titles and a new energy title focusing on renewable energy and bio-based products. Also, the strong rural development title will help bring new businesses to rural America and strengthen our rural communities.

As farmers are now in the fields planting their crops, I am pleased that they will now be able to focus on producing a crop, knowing we have taken the necessary steps to provide them with an effective safety net. I urge a yes vote on this conference report and no on the motion to recommit, so that this report can be approved quickly by both chambers and the bill signed into law, allowing the implementation process to get underway immediately.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE).

(Mr. THUNE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time. I want to thank the chairman and the ranking Democrat, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), for their great work in doing this and having the opportunity as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture and participating in the hearings around the country that led up to where we are today. We even had one hearing in Sioux Falls, South Dakota, and farmers and ranchers in South Dakota made it very clear that they want to see a number of provisions in the new farm bill. The countercyclical target price system that is in the bill will give

farmers needed assistance when times are tough.

The conservation provision. The Conservation Reserve Program, the Farmable Wetlands Pilot Program that was extended as part of an amendment that I offered on the House floor when it was debated here. The conservation security program is legislation that I sponsored in the House and that will give farmers incentives to do conservation practices on working lands, provisions like value-added that will enable our producers to reach up the ag marketing chain and become price makers rather than price takers. They are important value-added provisions that I worked hard for to have made a part of this farm bill.

The bio-energy program that encourages the production of bio-fuels such as ethanol and bio-diesel. These are all things that are going to be important to the future of agriculture.

Country-of-origin labeling, something as well that is important not only to the producers of this country but also consumers so they know where their products are coming from.

There are a couple of provisions, Mr. Speaker, that I would have liked to have seen in this bill that would prevent anticompetitive practices: a ban on packer ownership of livestock. I also would like to have seen a disaster declaration for the Black Hills National Forest that would allow us to treat the mountain pine beetle epidemic that we are dealing with there.

But on balance, Mr. Speaker, this is legislation that will move agriculture in a positive direction. I appreciate the chairman's and the ranking member's hard work.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House Agriculture Committee, I had the opportunity of participating in the two years of hearings that led up to this final conference report, even hosting one in Sioux Falls, South Dakota. Farmers and ranchers in South Dakota asked me to push four important goals in the farm bill: a countercyclical safety net, a strong conservation title, a commitment to value-added agriculture and creation of more competition in the agricultural marketplace. This bill goes a long way toward meeting these goals.

The commodity title of this bill establishes a new counter-cyclical target price system that will give farmers needed assistance when times are tough. Congress will no longer have to pass emergency legislation that, while much appreciated by farm country, does not provide the security that farmers need.

This farm bill increases our commitment to conservation by 80 percent. It is the "greenest" farm bill ever. It enhances current incentive programs, such as the Conservation Reserve Program by extending my Farmable Wetlands Pilot Program. It also creates a new Conservation Security Program that I sponsored in the House. The Conservation Security Program will give farmers incentives to do conservation practices on working lands.

Value-added agriculture has helped farmers in my state reach up the marketing chain to become price makers, rather than price takers. This farm bill includes two programs that are a result of my legislation to assist producers in

creative value-added enterprises. The first is the Value-added Market Development Grants that can be used for technical assistance and feasibility studies. The second is the Bio-energy Program that encourages the production of biofuels, such as ethanol and biodiesel.

This farm bill will enhance producer competition by requiring mandatory country of origin labeling for agricultural competition. In my tenure in Congress, I have always supported legislation for country of origin meat labeling. After offering an amendment during the committee consideration of this bill, I am pleased that it is in the final conference report.

Despite all of the bill's merits, I am disappointed the bill does not include two of my provisions that I fought to have included in the bill. First, there is no ban on packer ownership of livestock or other anti-trust provisions to protect farmers and ranchers from anti-competitive practices. However, I appreciate that the Chairman and Ranking Member have committed to hearings on this issue.

There is also another issue that should have been addressed in this bill, which is a disaster declaration for the Black Hills National Forest. Two areas of the Black Hills are at high fire risk because of fuel on the ground and the mountain pine beetle epidemic. This disaster declaration would have allowed the Forest Service to manage these areas for fire prevention. I want to thank Chairman COMBEST and Subcommittee Chairman GOODLATTE for giving their best effort to include this provision in the bill, but I am disappointed that it was not included in the final conference report.

Mr. Speaker, we need to complete this bill today. This legislation provides the certainty that producers need. Vote "yes" on the farm bill conference report.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PHELPS).

Mr. PHELPS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2646, The Farm Security and Rural Investment Act, and I want to thank the chairman and ranking member and conferees for their hard work on this balanced farm bill. I think this is the product of 2 years of bipartisan work that included extensive input from a wide spectrum of agriculture and conservation groups.

This farm bill will benefit farmers in my congressional district of central and southern Illinois, as well as across the country, for it provides a needed \$73.5 billion in initial funding for agriculture which has been facing historic low prices, low income and increased costs. The farm bill provides producers with more options to implement progressive conserving practices on their land and increased technical assistance to producers. Several conservation programs were included in this bill and increased, such as Conservation Reserve Program, Wetlands Reserve Program, Wildlife Habitat and Incentive Program and Grasslands Reserve Program.

As vice chairman of the Sportsmen Caucus, I feel this legislation provides a balanced approach to meeting conservation needs. Although the House version did not address or contain an

energy title, I am pleased to see the conferees adopted many of the Senate energy provisions. Throughout my career, I have worked to expand bio-energy and biofuels. Both ethanol and biodiesel are renewable sources and will greatly benefit the country.

I am pleased this balanced bill has reached us today. I urge Members' support.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to our colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

(Mr. LATHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman very very much for the opportunity to speak on this farm bill; and I want to give my personal thanks to the chairman of the committee and the ranking member for working very, very hard on a farm bill, holding, I think, 47 hearings around the country and for putting forth a strong effort in a very difficult situation.

My belief is any farm bill should help the family farm, the medium-, small-size family operator. And it is with great reluctance that I am going to oppose this farm bill because I think this takes us in exactly the wrong direction. This farm bill will hasten the demise of the family farm. It will subsidize the largest producers with an advantage over the medium-small producers, a dramatic advantage. It breaks all of our trade agreements. There is no question that the provisions in this are in direct opposition to what we have stood for as far as free, open trade. There is more money for conservation and environmental portions in this farm bill and those titles. The problem is they are rendered useless because all of the incentives on this farm bill are for more production. And I know farmers. I am one. And we are going to produce every possible bushel that we can to make sure that when these high payments are made that we are going to be able to reap the benefits. So those provisions I think are virtually useless in this farm bill.

One provision I think that causes great concern in Iowa is certainly the fact that one of the largest megahog producers, who has been a habitual offender as far as the environment, under this farm bill is going to be eligible and entitled to 450,000 tax payer dollars as a reward for not taking care of the environment. It is with great reluctance that I must oppose this farm bill.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA), chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill today. I must commend, first of all, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture along with the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) have done an incredible job of standing up for the rights of producers in this country under a great challenge, especially considering what some people in this town and elsewhere were proposing from a different part of the capital.

It is a good bill overall. There are some problems that we have to work through as we support this and move forward. The labeling provision is something that we know the chairman tried to work hard to not include in the bill but, unfortunately, it is in there along with the dairy provisions that are in there that are not good for some of our producers in our part of the country.

We also have some concerns with numerous new mandatory spending programs, programs that historically and rightfully fall under the discretion and funding jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations. I hope that Members do not forget the money associated with these new entitlement programs as my subcommittee attempts to respond to their funding requests in the FY 2003 agriculture appropriations bill. However, as Members of the Congress, we must base our votes on the positive areas of this bill. This is again a good bill overall for farmers and ranchers in this country and all associated with the bill. We are very pleased as well especially with the wool and mohair marketing loan provision that was put in the bill by our conferees. It is a good bill. I stand in strong support of this today.

□ 1145

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY).

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I want to, first of all, thank the chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM). I think every one of us in this body owe them our respect and gratitude for the great job they did on this bill.

There have been many things said about this bill, and if there is one thing this body stands for, it is that right for any Member to express their opinion and vote in that way, and I respect that. We have had many things said about this bill, but I can tell my colleagues one thing, we have people come and talk about how we are going to produce too much. Having too much food is like having too much money. It is pretty hard to do. We do not want to run out of either one of them, and when we do, we have got a major problem.

This is a good bill. It is a balanced bill. It treats everyone as fairly as we can with the resources that we have at our disposal.

The objective of a farm bill is food security. It is not a social program. America's farmers have served this country well. They deserve our support

and to be recognized with this bill, to continue to produce the cheapest, safest food supply in the history of this country.

I urge passage of this bill.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, could the Chair give us an accounting of the time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) has 11½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) has 14 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) for yielding me the time, and I congratulate him on a hard fought battle with the Senate, and I think that on balance he has prevailed in sticking to the bill that we attempted to bring forward from the House.

We have made concessions that I do not like. There are things in this bill that I do not like, but on balance, I think there are far more things in here that will help to assure the American public that they have an abundant, affordable and safe supply of food for the next several years.

I am also pleased that we were able to include in this the funding to make it possible to bring local television service into every home in America within the next few years, and I am also very pleased that we are providing additional funds for food banks, a far more efficient way to deliver food to those people in greatest need in this country than the food stamp program, which is still, unfortunately, in bad need of additional reforms.

Overall, I think this legislation will help America's farmers. It will help America's consumers, and as a result, I am pleased to lend my support to it.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) for yielding me the time, and I commend him and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) for producing this conference report, and I rise in guarded support of this conference report.

Basically I view the bill as a holding action. America obviously cannot undermine our farmers at a point when 70 cents of every farm dollar is coming from the government, and we ought to produce a different program that permits farmers to earn from the market. But this bill does have some historic titles that are important to building that future, importantly, the historic inclusion of an energy title. This title will really focus the Department of Agriculture on biofuels in every way, biomass for energy production, biobased products, et cetera.

There are some other important provisions in the bill, such as enhanced conservation and farmland protection,

Global Food for Education, and many of our international programs that help feed hungry people throughout the world and relieve the surplus on our market. We want to compliment the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for their terrific work there.

I think the bill falls far short in the area of assisting specialty crop producers to be included. Also, it does not do enough to break up concentration that is causing higher food prices, and really, a narrowing of those who can bring product to the market in this legislation.

I am not pleased with what was done on changing the language dealing with labelling of irradiated foods. But overall, we cannot undermine our farmers at a point when they need our support to maintain U.S. food security. I would urge my colleague's support of this legislation.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a sad day for our country. We are taking a big step in the wrong direction. I would say in the direction of Soviet style agricultural policy. It is hard to know where to begin with this bill, but let me start with the cost.

Here we are, a Nation at war, running a wartime budget, substantial deficits this year. We have got a budget baseline that already commits us to spending \$100 billion in farm subsidies over the next 10 years, and this bill commits us to add to that considerably more than the advertised additional \$75 billion. I say more because this bill knowingly uses dated commodity price assumptions that lowball the total cost. It also uses gimmicks such as creating a whole new \$100-million-a-year program and then pretending that that will only be funded for 1 year.

The truth is, the American taxpayer cannot afford this bill, but it is, in particular, a sad day for Republicans because we know better than to do this. This is a massive government subsidy of crops that is going to cause overproduction, that is going to cause further decline in crop prices and make a bad situation worse, especially for small farmers such as those in Pennsylvania.

We, who generally believe in freedom and independence and personal responsibility in the marketplace, we are in danger of systematically turning farms into dependent serfs of the Federal Government, already dependent on government for an average of 46 percent of their income. This bill will increase that to well over 50 percent.

This is a sad day for my Democratic colleagues, who often pride themselves for their support of the working people and the poorest in our society. This bill

is a massive transfer of wealth from poor people, and especially urban poor, to many large and wealthy corporations.

The Environmental Working Group observes that two-thirds of farm subsidies will go to 10 percent of farms, many of which have an average income of a quarter of a million dollars a year. The cost for the average American household is going to average \$4,400 over the life of this bill, \$1,800 in higher taxes, \$2,600 in higher food prices because of the price support mechanism.

Mr. Speaker, one of the great lessons of the 20th century clearly was that command control economics, government-run subsidies, government manipulations of the marketplace does not work. It leads to a misallocation of capital, distortion of the marketplace and prices, and economic ruin, but that is exactly the direction we are taking today with regard to farm policy in America.

I would urge my colleagues to support the motion to recommit, but if that fails, vote against passage of this bill.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) who has done a wonderful job on the committee in these last 2 years.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST), the chairman, and the ranking member, for the outstanding work that they have done in producing the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act.

Despite, Mr. Speaker, what my colleagues may have read in the newspapers around the country this morning, those of us that represent farm districts in America know this is the right farm bill for America today. We know that American farmers are facing their fifth straight year of record low prices, record high costs of production. We know that real net farm income is at its lowest since the Great Depression, and we know that American agriculture is competing in a global economy where our trading partners are subsidizing their farmers at considerably more than our country does before this bill.

We are simply equipping our farmers in America with the ability to compete and survive while we set the table, if I may add, Mr. Speaker, for presidential trade promotion authority, negotiating down trade barriers, negotiating down subsidies, to move toward that vision of a free market global agricultural economy.

Let the fields rejoice and all that is in them. We have a farm bill that will make American agriculture and America's food supply safe and secure.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) for yielding me the time, and I rise again in strong support of this bill. I want to focus a

little bit on this issue of the use of certificates, which has been debated here on the floor and was debated in the conference.

I come from a part of the country where certificates are not used a whole lot, and I have to admit that I did not have a good understanding of this program until we had considerable debate in the committee.

I think the people that are concerned about this whole payment limit question and use of certificates, first of all, should understand that in this bill there is language that will be law that is going to require us to look at this issue. So it is not going to go away, and we have set up a commission that is requiring USDA to come back to us with a study of this to find out who is actually getting this money and, if we made these changes, what would be the impact on farm income, land values and the infrastructure of agriculture.

In this area of certificates, I think that folks that do not represent farm country, and this is a complicated area, should understand what the implications are. If we do not have the certificate program, what will happen is that these folks that hit these limitations will forfeit these crops to the CCC. So the elimination of certificates will not change much what is going to happen, other than it will cost the government more money because this will be forfeited, and then we will incur the cost of storage, the cost of disposal of these crops that are forfeited to the CCC.

So actually, the use of certificates is a savings to the government, and we debated whether there should be reform in this area but, frankly, could not come to a resolution on what would be a better system. I think people need to understand that limitation in that area is not necessarily going to change a whole lot other than to cost the government more money.

Lastly, in this whole area of people should also understand that we put a limitation on adjusted gross income for individuals and net income for corporations. So that anybody that exceeds \$2.5 million of net income is going to be limited in getting these payments.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

(Mr. FLAKE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) for yielding me the time.

When I stood a week or so ago to oppose this bill, it was said from the other side, well, that fellow does not know anything about agriculture. If my colleagues look at the end of my right index finger, it is missing. It was cut off in a wind row at age 5 on an alfalfa field.

I have been away from the farm for a long time, but I still know manure when it is shoveled, and a lot of it is being shoveled here today.

This farm bill is bad for Americans. It will cost the average American family over \$4,000 in terms of direct taxes and price supports, inflated prices because of price supports over the next 10 years. We are abandoning the Freedom to Farm Act, and in its place, putting in a Farm Security Act.

We as Republicans should not be doing this. Democrats should not be doing it either. We ought to look past special interest politics and look at what is best for American families across the country, and at this point I am going to insert an article from The Wall Street Journal.

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 2, 2002]

BLOAT WATCH
(By Jeff Flake)

As a young kid growing up on a farm in northern Arizona, one of my more unusual chores was what I called "bloat watch." I would sit atop a hill with knife in hand, watching cattle grazing on the green alfalfa field below. As soon as the first critter assumed the bloated "I've fallen and I can't get up" position, I would rush to the victim, raise the knife and stab just behind the last rib high on the left side—then taken cover as pent-up gas and alfalfa spewed heavenward, raining down on boy and bovine. I'm sure that being stabbed in the side wasn't pleasant, but the alternative was to be unceremoniously dragged over the hill to the bone yard.

As we debate the newest farm bill in Congress, I find myself instinctively reaching for my old knife. There are many examples of bloated government in Washington, but none are just begging for the knife as much as our farm policy.

Last week, House and Senate negotiators approved a farm bill expanding payments to farmers by nearly \$50 billion over the next decade. The bulk of this increase, more than 90%, will go to farmers producing just five crops: wheat, corn, rice, cotton and soybean. Two-thirds will go to just 10% of farmers. The passage of this bill will mark a full scale repudiation of the Freedom to Farm Act of 1996, which sought to wean farmers off government assistance.

That the new farm bill is bad policy is not seriously disputed. It distorts the free market, wreaks havoc with incentives, further institutionalizes dependency and jeopardizes our export economy. But it is more than just bad policy—it is bad politics for Republicans.

The farm bill's \$173.5 billion price tag over 10 years make sour claim as the party of fiscal discipline purely relative. It is estimated that this legislation will cost the average American household \$4,377 over the next 10 years—\$1,805 in taxes and \$2,572 in inflated food prices because of price supports. That doesn't sound like a message this Republican wants to run on.

As evidenced in 1994, Republicans win elections when they draw a sharp contrast with Democrats. When Congressional Republicans seek to blur the lines, as we've done for the past several years, Democrats gain ground, as they've done for the past several years. There is an old political axiom that goes "You can never out-Democrat a Democrat." While we Republicans have tested that axiom's limits of late, we ought to understand that voters will eventually go for the genuine article. With this approach we might eke out another election with our slim majority intact, but our days are numbered.

On the other hand, if presented with an articulate "freedom" vs. "security" argument, most voters will opt for the former. The dilemma for Republicans is that we've not

only abandoned the freedom argument in principle, we've dropped the rhetoric as well. Last week, at the same time Republican conferees on the farm bill were replacing the Freedom to Farm Act with the Farm Security Act, other House Republicans were holding a press conference where they slammed the Democrats for stealing the Republican Conference's "Securing America's Future" theme. Frankly, I'd rather be accused of stealing that patronizing theme than coining it. Let the Democrats have it.

In a 1964 speech, Ronald Reagan reminded us that there is no such thing as "left" or "right." Rather, there was only an "up" toward freedom or a "down" toward totalitarianism. "Those who would sacrifice freedom for security," Mr. Reagan said, "have already started down the downward path."

It is probably too late for Congress to reverse course on this farm bill. We can only hope that President Bush is watching, pen in hand, as Congressional Republicans abandon all discretion and graze on green alfalfa right along with the Democrats. Being stabbed with a veto pen might not seem pleasant, but it sure beats ending up in the political bone yard.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I want to first thank the chairman of this committee for his extraordinary efforts on behalf of the farmers and ranchers in Klamath Basin.

I intend to actively support this bill today because of what it is doing to solve the water problems we face not only in the Klamath Basin, but across the West. The increase of 80 percent in funding of conservation programs are what is going to make the difference so that our farmers get water this year.

It was little over a year ago that the Federal Government cut off the water to the 1,400 farm families in the basin. Many of them have gone bankrupt. Most of them had no income. It is an incredible tragedy that has been allowed to occur.

The chairman was successful in the conference in getting \$50 million earmarked specifically for an environmental quality investment incentive program that will help solve some of the problems and has been very supportive of our efforts to resolve the long-term water needs and problems in this basin to improve water quality and quantity. This is an extraordinary step forward that will bring real long-term solutions to the Klamath Basin.

I thank the Chairman for his diligence, his tireless efforts on behalf of those farmers and ranchers and for the other work in this farm bill that is going to make an extraordinary difference for the men and women who make their living off the land in Oregon.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time.

As I have repeatedly informed my colleagues since last April, the past year has seen a terrible crisis in the Klamath Basin of southern Oregon and northern California. On April 6 of last year, nearly 1,400 farmers and ranchers were denied water during the 2001 growing season in large part due to Endangered Species Act issues. Yet, earlier this

year the highly regarded National Academy of Sciences, NAS, which reviewed the Government's actions, found that there was "no substantial scientific foundation at this time for changing the operation of the Klamath Project to maintain higher water levels in Upper Klamath Lake, or higher minimum flows in the Klamath River." In other words, the Government's decisions that crippled the livelihood of farming and ranching families were not backed up by the science. The Government's actions were devastating in many ways, causing economic damage between \$135 million and \$200 million, depriving wildlife refuges of water and feed, and dumping lethally hot water into the Klamath River, thereby threatening the endangered coho salmon the Government was entrusted to help.

However, just because the Government made poor decisions doesn't mean there are not significant water quality and quantity problems that must be dealt with in this basin. That's why I support this farm bill and the \$50 million in funding for the Klamath Basin that is included in the Environmental Quality Incentive Program section of the bill. It is a wonderful way to make sure that those funds are spent where they will do the most good for fish, farmers, and waterfowl.

Since December of last year, the National Academy of Sciences issued its report criticizing the decisions made by the Government. That critique has now been included in the new biological assessment, BA, issued by the Bureau of Reclamation. In addition, the President has created a cabinet-level task force to address the unique and complicated issues in the Klamath Basin. The farm bill provides an 80 percent increase in conservation funds to pay for the very types of projects that must be done if we are ever to solve the water quality and quantity issues in the basin.

I have refused to forget that this is the farm bill, and the purpose of what we do in the farm bill is to make sure that we have a vibrant agricultural economy in the Klamath Basin and throughout this country. The steps taken in the bill will improve fish habitat, will improve water quality and quantity, and will improve the health of the national wildlife refuges. By doing all of these things we will improve significantly the chances that farmers and ranchers in the Klamath Basin will get the water they need and everyone comes out a winner.

Additionally, the conference committee was kind enough to include a feasibility study I crafted that was passed unanimously by this House last October, only to languish in the other body. This feasibility study is needed to address an imminent endangered species habitat claim against the Chiloquin Dam is southern Oregon, which is the Modoc Point Irrigation District's current gravity flow diversion source. This dam blocks endangered suckers from reaching 95 percent of their former spawning and juvenile rearing habitat in the warm water reaches of the Sprague River. Several parties have identified the Chiloquin Dam as constituting a significant habitat problem for endangered suckers. They include: The Klamath Tribes, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, Bureau of Reclamation, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the Klamath Water Users Association. This feasibility study was constructed in consultation with both the Modoc Point Irrigation District and the Klamath Tribes.

The study will include: Review of all alternatives for providing passage, including the re-

moval of the dam; determination of the most appropriate alternative; development of recommendations for implementing the alternative; and examination of mitigation needed for upstream and downstream water users as a result of such implementation.

Mr. Speaker, as you can see we have been working on this issue diligently for some time and I would be remiss if I did not thank a few Members and staff for their support during this process. I would like to especially thank Chairman COMBEST for putting these provisions in the farm bill. Congressman POMBO also gave me great counsel throughout the process. Chairman HANSEN and Chairman YOUNG, the conferees from the House Resources Committee, were invaluable. And finally, Doug Yoder and Steve Petersen from the Resources Committee and Lance Kotschwar and Bill O'Connor from the Agriculture Committee went to great lengths to secure this needed help for the Klamath Basin. I'm indebted to all of them.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

(Mrs. CLAYTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) for yielding me the time.

I also want to congratulate him and our chairman for their diligent work and that a word needs to be said about the process. It was an engaged process. It was over 2 years. Many individuals and representative companies and organizations had their day. Rather, everyone had their day. I am not sure but certainly it was not for a lack of trying, was not lack of openness and effort to be involved in it. So process does help as well as the end product.

This is not indeed a perfect bill. With any bill this size there will be winners and losers. It is not perfect by any means. There are indeed winners. The winners hopefully will be our farmers who indeed will have opportunity to know about what rules will work.

There are some things that go too far in my judgment, but it is a bill that is basically going to ensure a safety net for our farmers, and it also takes the uncertainty out of our market fluctuation.

More importantly for me, Mr. Speaker, there are indeed some great strides made for constituents that I represent and constituents in disadvantaged communities throughout this country. I believe that the food stamp program is one of the most effective tools we have to ensure that no parent in America is unable to feed their children. It is our Nation's largest child nutrition program, and through this bill we make a number of modifications that allow working families, children, elderly to have food. Additionally, we also make provisions internationally as well.

I would be remiss not to say that my peanut farmers are desperately needing some certainty of that. Indeed that is a costly program, I will admit that, but it is costly when we ask sectors of our

economy to make tremendous change and transition. So American taxpayers are being asked to assist in this transition.

It is a bill that is worthy of our support. It is a bill indeed if it is to go back to conference to be rewritten means that our farmers will have more uncertainty than they have now.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the food stamp program is one of the most effective tools we have to ensure that no parents in America are unable to feed their children. It is our Nation's largest child nutrition program. It helps us fulfill our basic responsibility to assist the neediest among us in meeting their most basic need, proper nutrition. In my years on the Agriculture Committee, I have worked to strengthen the food stamp safety net so that it can help provide nutritionally adequate diets to families in our Nation's rural and urban areas alike.

I am delighted that the nutrition title of the farm bill that is before us today contains many significant improvements that are targeted toward low-income families with children, particularly the working poor. It goes a long way toward restoring food stamp benefits to legal immigrants and their families by ensuring that all legal immigrant children are eligible for food stamps and by incorporating the administration's proposal to make food stamps available to all otherwise eligible legal immigrants after they have lived in the United States for 5 years. The bill will allow transitional food stamps for families that are leaving welfare to help keep them connected to this critical work support program. It also simplifies the program, which will reduce paper work and red tape and remove some barriers that eligible families face in trying to receive food stamps.

And, on another positive note, the title contains additional money for the Emergency Food Assistance Program to help our Nation's food pantries and soup kitchens respond to the growing demands they have faced in recent years.

I thank Mr. STENHOLM and Mr. COMBEST for their leadership on the farm bill and on the nutrition title in particular. I want to associate myself with Mr. STENHOLM's statement on the nutrition title and I would like to add a few remarks on some of the key provisions.

The bill makes a remarkable improvement to food stamp eligibility for legal immigrants. I am pleased that many of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle have joined with President Bush to recognize that the restrictions on immigrant eligibility from welfare reform went too far and put too many low-income immigrant families with children, many of whom are citizens, at risk.

The final agreement restores food stamps to all eligible legal immigrant children and does so without requiring sponsor deeming. This should simplify the message that States and advocates provide to needy families. Poor children are eligible for food stamps, period.

We conformed food stamp eligibility rules for legal immigrant adults to those in TANF and Medicaid. This should make it easier for the States to administer the three programs jointly. Qualified immigrants who came to the United States at least 5 years ago will be eligible for food stamps. Of course, this is subject to the sponsor deeming rules. Because USDA's rules on sponsor deeming are sensible and balanced, we choose to continue the current

USDA sponsor deeming rules. We have no intention of sabotaging this restoration by making low-income sponsors that live with eligible immigrants and receive food stamps to incur a liability because their family member is part of their food stamp household.

Another important benefit improvement in the bill is the reform of the food stamp standard deduction for all households. Prior to 1995, the food stamp standard deduction had adjusted for inflation each year to reflect that fact that the cost of basic and necessary expenses that households have to make before purchasing food rise each year. The standard was frozen in 1995 for cost savings and has been \$134 ever since. Under this legislation, the standard will be adjusted for inflation each year. In addition, it will be scaled to household size to reflect the fact that larger households have higher basic living expenses. This provision will take effect this fall, which may be difficult for some states. I encourage USDA to be flexible with states that are doing the best they can but who cannot implement on time.

Despite these critical benefit improvements, I am deeply disappointed that the final agreement on the farm bill does not include a Senate provision that would have modestly eased one of the very harshest provisions of the 1996 welfare law, the 3-month time limit on participation by unemployed childless adults. The provision denies food stamps to some of our Nation's most vulnerable individuals. The provision disproportionately affects African-Americans, veterans, and the homeless, among other groups. While I have been pleased with the steps USDA has taken to implement this overly restrictive provision in regulation and urge the Secretary to continue to do everything she can to ease the harsh effects of this provision, I hope that Congress can revisit the eligibility rules for this group at some point in the future.

While we did not ease the 3-month time limit, the farm bill does eliminate the 80 percent set-aside of unmatched Federal employment and training funds for individuals subject to the time limit. Nonetheless, the new rules require USDA to give this population, and States that elect to serve them, special consideration when allocating employment and training funds among states. States that serve large numbers of unemployed childless adults should continue to have the resources to do so.

On a positive note, this bill gives States more opportunity to develop employment and training services that do not meet the strict definition of a work activity under the 3-month time limit. Services such as job search and programs lasting less than 20 hours per week may not be funded with these monies. While individuals subject to the time limit who participate in these activities will not meet the definition of work for purposes of the 3-month time limit, the services may help them find employment before the three months expire.

Turning toward another provision, one of our most important goals in designing this food stamp reauthorization was to make sure that families leaving welfare stay connected with the food stamp program. Currently as many as two-thirds of households leaving cash assistance for work, a time-limit or other reasons do not continue their enrollment in the food stamp program. These families still have very low incomes and are still eligible for food stamps. It was a priority to us to find a way to ensure

that these families keep receiving these critical nutrition benefits. States and client advocates have said that families fall off the program because clients are confused about their ongoing eligibility and that they often fail to complete paperwork requests from state agencies which result in their termination from the food stamp program.

The legislation gives States a very attractive new option that should make it quite simple to continue food stamps with no paperwork whatsoever to families leaving TANF. When a household leaves TANF, the States would simply recalculate its food stamps by subtracting the cash benefit from the family's income. No questions would be asked of the household. This new transitional food stamp amount would be the correct amount for the next 5 months.

Under this new option, we can be sure that poor families receive the nutrition assistance that they need to feed their families without any hassles or risks of losing the benefits for procedural reasons. If, at some point during the 5-month transitional period, the family thought that they might be eligible for more food stamps because their circumstances changed, they could always reapply for a higher benefit amount. This new approach should result in a dramatically higher share of families leaving welfare for work to continue receiving food stamps.

This legislation also responds to requests from States and clients to make the food stamp program simpler to administer and easier to understand. Unfortunately, just over half of eligible low-income families participate in the food stamp program. Many poor families are frustrated that they have to provide the State agencies with too much paperwork on unimportant details of their life and finances. And they are unhappy about having to reapply for benefits so frequently.

The nutrition title responds to this complaint by allowing for 6 months of continuous eligibility—unless the household's income rises above 130 percent of the poverty line or the State has some reason to believe that the family is ineligible. If States do not want to provide continuous eligibility, they can freeze households deductions, eliminating many reporting requirements in between certification periods. In this case a household would have to report changes in their earnings, but all other change reporting would be optional. States would only have to respond if the household reported a change in earnings or if they moved.

The bill also allows States to align the definitions of income and resources in the food stamp program with the ones that they apply in their Medicaid and TANF programs. This will give States unprecedented authority to align these aspects of eligibility across the three programs. USDA must now allow States to use data from their child support systems to determine what a household's child support deduction will be even if that data is somewhat old. This will relieve the household of having to keep track of every change in the payments that they make.

The utility component of the shelter deduction has been dramatically simplified. States now have an option that would require a household to only show one utility bill, other than a phone bill, in order to get a standard utility allowance. These changes should ensure that many more eligible families find it easier to get the help that they need.

I do wish that we had found ways to ease paperwork and office requirements on the elderly and disabled. It is my hope that USDA will explore this area and attempt to ease those burdens administratively.

I am delighted that we were able to work with the Senate and the administration to reform the food stamp quality control system. The current system set up half the States for failure by sanctioning all States with error rates above the national average. That is unfair. At least until very recently, it also has created inappropriate disincentives for states to serve large numbers of earners or immigrants because these households typically are more error-prone.

The new system targets sanctions at those states with persistently high error rates rather than any State above the national average. It also refocuses bonus payments away from just payment accuracy and will institute a new set of performance measures that will balance payment accuracy along with other measures of strong administration such as client service.

One element of the Senate-passed bill that interested me a great deal was adjustments to sanctions for States doing a particularly good job of serving low-wage working families or immigrant households. As it happens, however, we did not need to include this in the conference report because USDA assured the conferees that it would continue past practice and adjust sanction liabilities to eliminate the impact of high or rising proportions of working poor households or low-income immigrants. Given the Department's commitment to the adjustments, we saw no need to include adjustments in the statutory changes to the system.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of what we have achieved in this nutrition title. I believe that the farm bill strengthens the food stamp program by improving benefits and easing access for our low-income working families. This outcome is good for families, good for communities and good for farmers.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, could the Chair please give us once again the remaining time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) has 9 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) has 10½ minutes remaining.

□ 1200

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, other than my closing on the floor.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

(Mr. KIND asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, to understate the phrase, this has been a very difficult process, trying to put together a farm bill and projecting out in future years the needs of our family farmers, but we can still produce a better result. We need a farm bill, a farm bill that will

be a more fair and balanced farm bill for all our family farmers in all regions of the country.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I intend, at the conclusion of the debate, to offer a motion to recommit with instructions, based on a motion that already passed this House a little over 2 weeks ago with 265 Members of this House on record supporting a \$275,000 meaningful payment limitation cap consistent with the language that is already in the Senate bill and consistent with the majority wishes in the United States Senate.

There exists a majority in both the House and the Senate now to take this approach to farm policy, so we cannot only have a safety net for our family farmers but also be able to do it within the realm of fiscal responsibility and fiscal discipline; being able to provide more benefits to family farmers in all regions, while also maintaining the hope and promise that we can open up greater market access to agriculture products produced in this country. That has to be a part of any long-term farm policy.

Without a meaningful payment limitation cap, the next round of trade talks are in serious jeopardy, in my opinion. We are hearing the clash of the international community coming down on this Congress with the farm bill that is before us today, telling us it will jeopardize the ability to negotiate fair trade agreements for our American producers.

With the money and resources that are freed up with this payment cap, we would have more for volunteer and incentive-based conservation programs, programs that will lead to better watershed management, quality water supplies, the protection of wildlife and fish habitat, and, ultimately, the protection of productive farm land itself. We would be able to have additional resources for agriculture research, for rural development and nutrition programs, but also for the new energy program, relying on biomass and biofuels, which is the wave of the future.

Now, this is the way it should be decided, through a debate and by a vote. It should not be a clash of personalities; rather, an honest debate over ideas. I believe this motion to commit will produce a better farm bill at the end of the day and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), chairman of the Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, again I would like to commend the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture for crafting what I think is good sound farm policy and it will be a tremendous benefit to every farmer in America with this farm bill.

My State is the largest peanut-producing State in the country, and my district happens to be the second largest peanut-producing district. We are

very proud of that. We have a long and rich heritage. The peanut program in this bill is getting completely restructured and retooled for the reason that we have had a fight over the peanut program every year that I have served in this body.

There has been a philosophical objection to the way the peanut program was crafted because of the quota program that existed within that peanut program. Well, this year our peanut industry has gotten together as a whole and has made a decision we need to do what is best for the long-term interest of the peanut industry, and so we have drastically changed the peanut program within this farm bill, a program that now is going to benefit our quota holders, our producers, as well as our industrial base within the peanut community.

I am very pleased with the results we came out with. Is it perfect? No. But it does provide benefit to every aspect of the industry, and allows the peanut industry, particularly in my State, to have a long-term viable future. I urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the chief deputy whip.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and thank him and the ranking member for their great work on this bill. I think our conferees worked hard, did a tremendous job, kept this on focus, and my belief is that it was as likely as not that we could have wound up at the end of that conference without a farm bill if it had not been for the great dedication of the House conferees to make this happen.

This is a good bill. It sets the stage for several years of agriculture stability, provides a much-needed safety net that was not present in the last farm bill, it continues to decouple payments, allows updating of acreage, and does good things in dairy. More importantly, it establishes the rules and does that early enough that it may even have some positive impact this year.

We all worked hard to get this bill out. Of course, the House passed a bill months ago. Again, our conferees, the chairman and the ranking member, as they bring this bill to the floor, have a lot to be proud of. Farm families in America have a lot to look to with appreciation for the job we have done, the job I believe we will do today as we pass this bill, and I look forward to its implementation.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding

me this time. I have been involved in writing Federal farm legislation since the 1960s, when I was Michigan chairman of Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, and then I got an appointment in 1970 to be Deputy Administrator for Farm Programs in USDA down here in Washington.

I appreciate the effort that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) have gone through in arguing how they resolved many of the disputed issues in this bill as we try to get something for the whole country. But it seems to me, and I would suggest to my colleagues, that our goal in farm policy should be that we develop and help the mainstream family farmers in this country.

And you can argue how big is a family farm, but if you are talking about 20,000, 40,000, 60,000, 80,000 acres owned by the big landholders, that now have a loophole provision that is not subject to any payment limitation, then you are talking about a situation that puts the average family farmer at a disadvantage. The average commercial farm operation in this country is a little over 900 acres.

I am disappointed. This House, on my motion to recommit on April 18, voted overwhelmingly, 265 votes, to have the Senate provisions on payment limitations. This was not acknowledged by the conferees. The conferees should not be the House, they should reflect the will of the House.

Senator GRASSLEY just called me and said, look, we have done some whipping; we originally passed that provision for payment limitations by a little over two-thirds; we will accept the motion to recommit of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) to reinstate the Senate payment limitations.

The Senate per farmer, per year payment limitation gets rid of the loophole. The loophole is the fact that benefits from generic certificates are not included as part of the pay limitation. Without getting into detail, it is a maneuver where the loan price support programs do not come into play. As long as there is the tremendous pressures, special interest pressure, to have unlimited payment limitations that place our family farms at a disadvantage, I am very concerned about the future of ag legislation in the country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY). The Chair wishes to inform Members that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) has 6½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) has 9 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman would also inquire as to the closing rights.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would inform the Member that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) has the right to close.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD).

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member and the conference committee for their hard work in putting this good conference together.

There has been much said that this bill does not help family farmers and it helps big corporate farmers. Well, the provision that is in this bill, that I have worked for for 3½ years and that I am so proud of, is the dairy provision, and that is for family farmers. That is for every dairy farmer in the country. And there is a limit to the size of production that can receive a counter-cyclical support payment.

So that is very good for family farmers, and it is very good for conservation because it spreads the animals out across the country, and it is good for consumers because it assures us of a locally produced fresh supply of milk throughout this country.

So I would ask all the Members from both sides of the aisle who are in the dairy coalition to support this bill.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report. This agreement provides a strong safety net for our Nation's family farmers as well as for the small and disadvantaged farmers. It ensures a flexible, affordable, and top quality food supply for our consumers while strengthening our national security. It provides a 6-year reauthorization of the farm, rural development, conservation, and nutrition programs that are administered by USDA.

The bill provides nearly 80 percent more funding for conservation programs than the current law provides, providing environmental benefits for all Americans. The bill will help producers of all commodities stay on the lands that they hold and that they love so much so that they continue their livelihood while conserving our natural resources for future generations.

While not perfect, the agreement today also addresses many of the needs of those in southwest Georgia, in the second district, in terms of making strides in restructuring the crucially important peanut program. Let us not allow the perfect to be the enemy of the good. Let us pass this conference report today for our farmers so that we can move forward with this year's planting season and have American agriculture continue to be the best in the world.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY), my friend and colleague on the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill with a great deal of personal anguish because of the respect I have for the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST)

and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM). But as a Member of Congress serving on the Committee on Agriculture, and as a farmer, I believe this is not the right policy for U.S. agriculture in this new century.

Henry Wallace, back in the 1930s, when he was Secretary of Agriculture under President Roosevelt, said when they instituted programs very similar to these that these were temporary solutions to deal with an emergency. We are still dealing with the same temporary solutions. And where has it gotten us?

□ 1215

It has gotten us to the point where last year 40 percent of net farm income in this country was government taxpayer dollars. And with the bill that we are passing today, that 40 percent will increase to 50 percent in the near term. Too many times we hear people do not understand how little of agriculture is actually receiving these taxpayer subsidies. Eighty percent of the agricultural products that are produced in this country receive not 1 cent of taxpayer money.

We can go into any supermarket and walk down the produce aisle, and every product in that produce aisle does not get a taxpayer subsidy. The meat and poultry aisle, there is not one product that gets a direct subsidy from the taxpayer. We can go down the canned fruit and canned vegetable aisle, and not one product there gets a subsidy from the government. We are passing a program that is going to ensure that 20 percent of the agricultural commodities that are grown in this country are going to get 70 percent of \$170 billion over the next 10 years, and that is wrong.

I am concerned that policies in this bill are going to ensure that we are going to continue to see overproduction because of the way that we have structured our marketing loan programs and our counter-cyclical payments.

Mr. Speaker, it is important for us to have a safety net, but we need to do so in a manner that does not distort the marketplace, and this bill does that at the expense of taxpayers. It is not only at the expense of taxpayers, this bill creates distortions against other farmers throughout this country.

There has been a lot of talk about the peanut program which is crying out for reform. It does not cost taxpayers a dollar right now. But the reform that is embodied in this bill will result in taxpayers spending \$4 billion over the next decade. That is not appropriate. What it also will ensure is that it will increase the supply of peanuts that are in the marketplace.

When I represent a district that has an almond industry that is twice the size of the peanut industry, they are going to be facing increased competition with peanuts that being subsidized by the taxpayer, that are going to drive down the price of the pistachios, walnuts and almonds that receive no

taxpayer support because of the taxpayers stepping in providing \$4 billion to a competitive product in the snack food market. That is wrong.

We also have another problem in the dairy program. We are embarking on a path with the dairy program that is going to result in taxpayers most likely putting out \$2 billion. What are they going to get for that \$2 billion, increased production, which is also going to require these same taxpayers to purchase more butter and powder so they are going to be out more money.

What are other dairy farmers going to face? They are going to see lower prices because of this new taxpayer subsidy, which is going to result in farmers in California, dairy farmers, losing over \$6 million in the next 3 years.

Mr. Speaker, we had an opportunity to pass a policy that would move us into a new direction that could have invested in products and enhanced the productivity and competitiveness of our farmers, and we lost that opportunity. I encourage my colleagues to vote no on this bill.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PICKERING).

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report and to commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) for their leadership as we do a bill that is good for our farmers, good for the environment, conservation, and good for our catfish farmers in Mississippi as we stop the Vietnamese imports of false labeling, of the taking the good name that we have developed in the southeast of the good catfish, good flavor, the good taste.

I also want to say that this is good for research as we see our land grant universities increase in research, for our rural communities, and as we see our key infrastructure needs being met.

As a sportsman, it will be good for wildlife as we see the CRP and WRP programs almost double. I support this legislation which establishes a safety net so we can plan and plant and prosper in Mississippi and across the country in agriculture. This is good legislation, a good farm bill, and I thank the chairman for his good work.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Committee on Agriculture for the good job that they have done. I have some serious concerns about this bill, and my concerns are that our sugar program continues to drive food processors and candy makers out of business in my community. We are continuing to lose jobs by the hundreds because they cannot afford the high cost and the high prices that they are paying for sugar.

I also have some concerns that the civil rights, that the concerns expressed by minority farmers are not adequately addressed. I grew up on a small farm, and so I know what minority farmers are feeling and what their experiences are.

I hope as we continue to develop our agricultural policy, that we take those concerns and put them at the top of the list rather than the bottom of the list. Again, I commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) for the work that they have done, but I cannot support a bill that will not provide for the food processors in my community to stay in business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY). The Chair wishes to inform Members that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) has 7 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Livestock and Horticulture.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill; but it is not a perfect bill. There are problems. I have had the same problems that the chairman and the ranking member had in trying to work through this particular piece of legislation to get the best possible bill that we could to be enacted into law.

For those Members who have stood up this morning and talked about how they were concerned about it being bad farm policy. I would caution them on the motion to recommit. If Members think that there is a problem with the current bill, look at the motion to recommit. That is the worst possible farm policy that we could adopt in any way. We turn it into a welfare program. We try to say that the purpose of farm policy is to support those small, disadvantaged farmers so that they can get a welfare check. Well, if that is what we really want, we should just make it a welfare program. That is a huge problem.

It also transfers money into conservation title. At a time when we are fighting to open markets for us to ship into and other markets to ship into us, they want to take as much land as they possibly can out of production and ship that production offshore.

Mr. Speaker, that is the worst possible farm policy that we could possibly come up with as the U.S. Congress. No matter what we do on this bill, Members have to vote, begins the motion to recommit.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, earlier I pointed out my broad concern with the high loan rates that we have in this bill and the fact that it will depress commodity prices requiring more of net farm income to come from the government. Last year's

figure was 40 percent of net farm income came from the government. I believe with lower prices as a result of this bill, that number will exceed 50 percent quickly.

There are other problems with the bill. I think the message this sends to our trading partners around the world is the wrong message. These payments will violate our trade agreements with the World Trade Organization, and send a strong signal to our allies who worked with us to reduce trade barriers around the world that we are not serious about this. It tells our competitors we are going to continue to do what we have been asking them not to do.

Secondly, when it comes to the issue of labeling, I think it violates our agreement with our neighbors, Mexico and Canada, and I think it is discriminatory against our other trading partners around the world. So from a trade standpoint, I think we are sending some mixed and bad messages.

The dairy program that we have contained in this bill is totally unnecessary. Over the last 4 years, in all of agriculture, dairy prices were at record highs. Dairy farmers had the best 4 years they ever had. Why do we need to spend \$2 billion for dairy? Pure and simple, for political reasons coming from the other body. It is unnecessary, it will drive down prices, and will drive up exposure to the taxpayers.

But as I close, as Members of Congress, we are here, and we are here to make decisions on behalf of our constituents. As I said earlier, this is not an easy decision on my part or others who are opposing this bill. We have great respect for the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) who have guided this process; but we have to make a decision as Members of Congress, and the decision I have made, reluctantly, is to oppose this bill because in the end, it will lead to much bigger problems.

We have heard that if we do not pass this bill, we will have really big problems. We can do an emergency supplemental to fix those problems in the short run, and we can produce this bill in a much more sane political environment that will give us a much better product after the election early next year.

Mr. Speaker, the point I want to make to my colleagues is that we can do better. I know that it is a difficult process to come up with a uniform policy for the whole country, but the fact is that we can do better. We must do better to balance the interest amongst those in agriculture, and to balance the interest of those in agriculture with the interest of the taxpayers and others who are always here seeking our government help.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOEHNER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman would feel better if he rec-

ognizes, as I do, that in this bill there is a continued movement by the farm communities towards market orientation, and that should help the gentleman.

Mr. BOEHNER. Reclaiming my time, I would argue that the opposite is exactly true. I reluctantly urge Members to vote no on this bill.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the remaining time and correct some of the misstatements that have been made concerning this bill.

To those that suggest that we need a little more time, where were they for the last 2½ years when the committee and subcommittees held numerous hearings all over the country? I did not notice many of my colleagues being the most vocal being in many of the hearings much of the time.

To those that suggest that these are too high loans for cotton, which has come under a little bit of discussion, the loan rate for cotton in this bill is 52 cents. That is exactly what it was in 1986. So to those that suggest we have too high loans, they are completely ignoring market reality.

To those that said that we are getting 40 percent of our income from the government, the 2000 figures from WTO show that the United States farmer receives 22 percent of his income from the government, which I agree is too high, but the farmers in the European Union gets 38 percent of their income from government.

A lot of the other comments today, particularly some of the editorial comments that we have had on this bill, reminds me what President Eisenhower said in the 1950s: "Farming looks mighty easy when your tractor is a pencil, and you are a thousand miles away from the corn patch."

I think many of the comments that have been made in the editorial pages are completely ignoring the market reality that we have down on the farm, particularly when we see conservation, that we did not do enough on conservation. There is an 80 percent increase in this bill, the largest single increase in conservation spending, I believe, in the history of the Congress.

Budgetary responsibility, take a look at what we have done time and time again regarding emergency ad hoc disaster assistance: \$30 billion over the last 4 years. What we do in this bill is put in predictability. The lion's share of spending in this bill does not go to stimulate production, only \$2.8 billion goes toward marketing loans. The rest goes for nutrition, trade, conservation, and rural development. That is not quite what was stated on this floor.

□ 1230

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot about the \$73.5 billion. This year the American farmer and rancher will export \$54.5 billion worth of our commodities. If you multiply that by 10, that means the return on investment for the

United States taxpayer will be \$545 billion, assuming we do not gain any additional market share.

Now, I think it is particularly interesting that some of our foreign competitors are lending their voices to criticism of the work of the bill that we put before the full House today.

The European Union Commissioner has said that the United States should receive a failing grade on the farm bill. He recently said in a statement of April 30, "I am astonished by claims made in the United States Congress that much of these price-linked subsidies would not be counted against U.S. commitments. The U.S. will have to respect WTO rules."

Absolutely we will respect WTO rules. Nothing in this bill and what the Committee on Agriculture has recommended in this conference bill has anything other than we will respect WTO rules. I say to the Agriculture Commissioner of the European Union that his facts are wrong and that this conference report will comply with all of the U.S. trade obligations within the WTO.

In fact, it is interesting to me, the European Union's commissioner is saying this because he seems to be trying to draw attention away from his own problems subsidizing agriculture.

Basically what we are doing with this bill, we are saying loudly and clearly as we enter the next WTO round, the United States Government will stand shoulder to shoulder with our producers in the international marketplace and we will negotiate down these subsidies, but we will demand that other countries do an equivalent amount, instead of what has happened to us time and time again in previous negotiations. We seem to be the ones to cut.

When you have a situation today in which European farmers are subsidized by over \$300 an acre, and we are in the \$40 range, is that fair? Is that a level playing field? I say to my friends until Europe, let us negotiate them down. Let us recognize that, yes, all farmers would be better off if we did not have as much government involvement, but we are not going to unilaterally disarm our farmers. And those who choose to vote for the motion to recommit or against this bill, that is exactly what you are doing.

Finally, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, time and time again we ignore this one fact: we as a Nation are blessed to live in a country that has the most abundant food supply, the best quality of food, the safest food supply at the lowest cost to our people of any other country in the world. That does not happen by accident.

That happens because, time and time again, we have had agricultural programs that recognize the importance, yes, of the safety net to our producers, but also to conservation, to food stamps, to feeding people, to addressing the critical needs in rural development. We have always done this. And

this bill today, one of the strongest titles is the nutrition title. It distinguishes itself as one of the most important pieces of food stamp legislation since the landmark 1977 act 25 years ago.

The most significant program simplification since the 1977 act is in this bill. Many of the title provisions are targeted toward low-income families with children, particularly the working poor. The bill will allow transitional food stamps for families that are leaving welfare. The things we have said over and over that we want to accomplish, this bill accomplishes it in the nutritional title.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on the motion to recommit. It will not make the bill better. I encourage my colleagues to support this balanced bill that does not only what our American farmers want done but the 280 million American consumers that will benefit from that which we are about to pass.

Mr. Speaker, I have always believed a strong nutrition title is a crucial part of any farm bill. That is particularly so when we can improve our ability to support hard-working low-income families and to ensure that all Americans have the opportunity to obtain a nutritionally adequate diet. Doing so gives balance to the bill and benefits both production agriculture and low-income Americans. I am pleased that this year's farm bill has a nutrition title that all of us can be proud to support.

The nutrition title stands out in several respects. It strengthens incentives for families to work and thereby promotes welfare reform goals. It does so by making food stamps better available to low-income working poor families that do not want to get welfare. It does so by facilitating the transition from welfare to work. It does so by targeting relief on needy families with children, particularly the working poor. And, it does so by simplifying the program. Under this bill, States and low-income households alike should find less paperwork and red tape. We can reduce errors while also removing some obstacles to eligible working families receiving food stamps.

The nutrition title contains a number of reforms that the states have been calling for on a bipartisan basis, including restored eligibility to legal immigrants that play by the rules. In addition, the title adds funding for the Emergency Food Assistance Program to help food banks and food pantries meet the needs they face.

I would particularly like to thank Chairman COMBEST, Representative GOODLATTE and Representative CLAYTON as well as all the members of the House Agriculture Committee for their work on this title. I am pleased that we have developed a title with strong bipartisan support believe that it will make concrete improvements in the nutrition safety net for low-income families.

Of course, I know that most Members have not had the opportunity to pore over the dense legislative language of the nutrition title in detail. I therefore would like to take this opportunity to explain some of the key food stamp provisions on behalf of myself and Representative CLAYTON, the ranking member on the Department Operations, Oversight, Nutrition and Forestry subcommittee of the Agriculture

Committee, so that Members can have an idea how much this title has achieved and what an important component it is of this overall legislation.

One of our top priorities in this legislation is to help low-income families make the transition from welfare to work. Significant research shows that many families that leave the TANF cash assistance program do not receive food stamps even though they have very low-incomes and remain eligible. The Urban Institute found that only 40 percent of families that leave welfare continue to receive food stamps. This has meant that hundreds of thousands of low-income families that worked their way off welfare, only to lose one of the most critical work supports available to them—food stamps.

Food stamps can mean the difference between whether these families have enough income to put food on the table every day. It is in everyone's interest for these families' difficult transitions to be successful. A family is unlikely to regard its transition from welfare to work as a success if it cannot feed itself.

This legislation offers states a new option called transitional food stamps that would eliminate food stamp paperwork requirements for those families leaving TANF. This should enhance the food stamp program's ability to support families moving from welfare to work. States can provide this new transitional benefit to any category of eligible household that they choose except certain households under sanction for misconduct.

When a household leaves the state's cash assistance program, the state would simply recalculate their food stamp benefits without the cash benefits. This new amount would be the correct food stamp amount for all purposes and would be frozen for the next 5 months. There would be no contact between the state and the household at the beginning of the transitional period. Thus, the household would not have to comply with any procedural requirements to remain on the program.

We would give states the flexibility to make this a transitional benefit a freeze or to make adjustments for changes they become aware of in other programs. These changes could include a cost of living adjustment in Social Security benefits or a newborn child whom the state is covering under Medicaid or SCHIP. Of course, states would always have to adjust for automatic changes in the food stamp program such as the Thrifty Food Plan or the standard deduction.

As is always the case during a certification period, a household would retain the right to reapply to have its food stamps recalculated based on its current circumstances. Some households likely will experience major changes that render their transitional benefit amounts inadequate. These could include the loss of employment or the birth of a child. In these cases, the household may decide it is worth its while to go through the process of reapplying to have its benefits adjusted accordingly.

I am very pleased that the nutrition title will make significant strides toward simplifying the food stamp program. This can only help states, eligibility workers, working poor families, and everyone else connected with the program.

Last year, America's Second Harvest released a report entitled, "The Red Tape Divide." This report detailed how long and complicated food stamp applications around the

country are. Some of the problem is because some states have yet to take steps to simplify their applications. But another part of the problem is that federal food stamp rules require far too much detail from households on unimportant matters.

This legislation provides states with several new options to streamline the food stamp program. These should result in less paperwork for those households already participating in the program as well as shorter food stamp applications. USDA should work with states to ensure that states are able to implement these provisions on the effective dates and need not wait for regulations.

Arguably, the biggest impact will come from the provision allowing states to extend "semi-annual reporting" to a broader group of households. Currently, states may only apply semi-annual reporting to households with earnings. Semiannual reporting eliminates a household's reporting obligations for 6 months at a time unless its income rises the program's gross income limit. The household provides information once every 6 months and the state relies upon this snapshot to issue benefits for the next 6 months.

This will significantly reduce paperwork and other administrative burdens on both participating households and state agencies. It directly responds to states' request to have more latitude within this option. This should encourage more states to adopt the option. It also should help align reporting rules among food stamps, TANF, and Medicaid. We encourage USDA to work with HHS to issue joint guidance on how states may use this new option to reduce overall reporting burdens for families as well as to better coordinate reporting requirements.

For example, we are concerned that under the current option that when a household reports a change for the purposes of the Medicaid program it could threaten the household's receipt of food stamps. This could be true even though the household remains eligible for food stamps. That makes no sense. A household should not be at risk of losing its food stamps unless the state has reason to believe that the household is no longer eligible for food stamps.

In crafting this proposal, we assume that the Department's major procedural rules for monthly reporting will apply to this option as well. For example, if a household files a late or incomplete semiannual report, it should be given an opportunity to supply the missing information.

We were disappointed not to have found a way to reduce reporting burdens significantly for the elderly, the disabled and other groups excluded from periodic reporting. I hope USDA will explore options that could ease their reporting requirements for these households as well so that we can build upon this legislation's momentum.

The bill allows states to align the definitions of income and resources in the food stamp program with the ones they apply in their Medicaid or TANF programs. Of course, the food stamp income and resource eligibility thresholds will remain, but these two provisions should give states sweeping new authority to eliminate unnecessary questions on their food stamp applications form about livestock, plasma sales state work study programs, individual retirement accounts, interest income, etc. We do include modest lists of items that

states may not exclude under the new authority to conform. Obviously these lists are intended only to limit exclusions under the new paragraphs we are adding to the act. They do not affect exclusions under other paragraphs of sections 5(d) or (g). We urge the Secretary to add to these lists only where absolutely essential to ensure that food stamp benefits reasonably reflect need.

Along with simplifying the reporting and counting of income, we also simplified the deductions states apply to determine households' incomes. The shelter deduction targets food stamp benefits to households that have the most trouble affording a nutritious diet because their incomes are so low they have little left over for food after paying their shelter costs. Households typically can deduct utility expenses in addition to their rent or mortgage, other payments they must make to get or keep ownership of their homes, fire insurance, and a few other costs.

Since utility expenses vary so much from month to month, the program allows states to calculate households' utility costs with a fixed estimate, or standard utility allowance, in lieu of computing each household's particular utility bills. In welfare reform, we allowed states to require that all households's shelter deductions be calculated based on such a standard utility allowance or SUA.

In this bill, we further simplify the SUA by allowing some states to eliminate some of the current restrictions on when households may claim it. This provision would apply if the state took the option from welfare reform to require household to use the standard instead of their actual utility bills. In these states, if a household can show that it has at least one utility bill, other than just a telephone bill, the household would receive the SUA. It would not matter if the household was doubled up with another family or individual.

In recent years we have seen the utility costs households face soar in certain areas of the country because of various energy crises. I expect that these mandatory standards will be updated each year to reflect rising utility costs in the state. That will ensure that needy families do not have to choose between buying food for their families and paying their heat and other utility bills.

I am pleased that we were able to craft this legislation so that the new simplification options can begin to make a difference soon. On several of them USDA is likely want to promulgate rules. States will not have to wait for USDA to do so, however, before implementing the new options. For example, they can conform their definitions of income and resources to those in TANF or Medicaid without waiting for USDA to promulgate regulations about the items that cannot be excluded in the name of conformity.

Similarly, they can implement the provision allowing them to ignore most changes in households' deductions between certification periods without waiting for USDA to promulgate new regulations. They would, of course, still have to comply with existing USDA rules on when changes in earned income must be reflected in recalculated benefits. And, states would have to adjust benefits when a household elects to report that they have moved. The new rules, however, give states many options for minimizing the number of changes that require action. Freezing households' deductions is unlikely to cause significant hard-

ship since the household can always reapply before the end of its certification period if a major rent increase, large new child care costs, or other deductible expenses render the household's current allotment inadequate.

Despite Congress's best efforts over the years, child support payments are not always as regular as they ought to be. This has caused states concern about when they should anticipate that a household will make or receive a payment. We examined this question closely. Fortunately, a large part of the answer can be found in longstanding USDA regulations on anticipating income. Whether a state is determining gross income or net income, these regulations provide that it may only count amounts reasonably certain to be received during the month in question. Last year, USDA amplified these regulations with some extremely helpful guidance that also gave states new options for simplifying the treatment of child support payments that a household receives.

This legislation builds upon that effort by extending the simplification to replace the deduction for child support payments made with an optional income exclusion. States now can exclude any legally obligated child support payments made by a household completely from income calculations. Thus, these potentially volatile payments need no longer be considered when applying the gross income eligibility limit. We did not mandate this change to avoid forcing states to undertake costly reprogramming of their computers purely to implement this provision.

In addition, the legislation directs USDA to establish procedures that permit states to rely on information from the state child support enforcement agencies in calculating households' incomes. We expect USDA will allow states great flexibility to rely on older information that might otherwise be appropriate. States' child support enforcement agencies often have computers that do not mesh effectively with the systems states rely upon to calculate food stamps. The value of simplification in this area seems far more important than that of requiring the household to verify the most current possible information. Of course, a household that chooses to submit information about recent changes in its child support obligations or payments should receive whatever food stamps those changes justify.

Finally, the legislation includes an experimental approach to providing food stamps to persons residing in certain kinds of institutions. Where a drug or alcohol rehabilitation center or similar facility would have served as the households' authorized representative anyway, the legislation allows states to provide a food stamp benefit directly to the home. As long as the claimant lived in the institution, the benefit would be calculated under a standardized formula that would not require the institution to gather a great deal of detail about the circumstances of each resident.

These procedures only apply in facilities that qualify as institutions under USDA's rules. Those regulations correctly limit the definition of an institution to a place that provides the majority of meals to its residents over the course of a month. The new group home procedures would not apply to a facility that does not regularly provide most of each resident's meals.

Also, we do not intend it to limit in any way the ability of victims of domestic violence or

others that are capable of managing their own benefits to participate under regular food stamp rules. We certainly do not want to compound the tragedy of domestic violence by stripping a woman of her food stamps.

This experiment should be a great convenience to centers as well as state agencies. In return for that convenience, we expect USDA and the states will require participating centers to have reliable systems for passing along notices to households and providing forwarding addresses to the state agency when a household moves. Residents leaving these centers in mid-month should not have to try to get by without adequate food assistance.

Upon investigating a few of the Senate bill's simplification proposals, we were delighted to find that USDA's regulations already provide states the option to simplify the program. For example, I was pleased to learn that the current rules allow states to simplify the conversion of weekly and biweekly amounts of earned income deduction in the food stamp program if they have done so in TANF. Under this authority, Maryland multiplies weekly paychecks by four to calculate monthly income in both TANF and food stamps. Thus, we saw no need to adopt a Senate provision in this area that would have reduced the earned income deduction.

Similarly, the Senate bill included a complicated provision that would have converted the food stamp recertification process into a redetermination system. Although this long has been a problem in the food stamp program, we discovered that recent changes USDA has made in its regulations address the major concerns. No one disputes the principle that a household should be able to receive food stamps continuously as long as it remains eligible. Also, no one intends that certification periods be so rigid as to create unnecessary burdens on either state agencies or households. On the other hand, we do believe it is important that states periodically confirm that a family in the food stamp program remains eligible just as they would for a family in any other on-going public benefit program.

Recent USDA regulations give states broad flexibility to extend certification periods without going through recertification processes. They also allow states to undertake reviews in the middle of an unexpired certification period by sending a request for contact where the state knows an important change has occurred but does not have enough information to act on that particular change. In both instances, the key is eligibility rather than an arbitrary review schedule set months in advance. The transitional food stamp provisions in both USDA regulations and this legislation similarly avoid entrapment in rigid certification periods.

The only question the Senate provision raised, then, was one of procedure. We preferred to maintain the one we had. Switching to a redetermination model would require states to undertake a costly reprogramming of their computers. It also could have allowed some inattentive eligibility workers to ignore review schedules and send food stamps to indisputably ineligible for many months.

Not only did we seek to simplify by changing the program, we also sought to promote innovative approaches to simplification within the existing structure of the program. Each year, USDA will have a significant pool of money it can use to fund creative uses of the discretion states already have to ease access

for low-income working families and others in need. For example, my state has pioneered centralized change reporting centers that ensure that someone is always available to receive a household's report of an increase or decrease in its monthly wages. I hope that USDA will use some of this money to fund efforts to create joint applications for food stamps, Medicaid, and other work supports for households that do not want to receive welfare. In this regard, USDA should not hesitate to fund a promising idea that would improve the food stamp program just because its benefits might spill over into other areas.

Beyond these simplification provisions, we have made numerous other improvements in nutrition programs. We have streamlined the employment and training program to allow states easier access to these funds. This will give states flexibility to serve other groups of people that cannot receive employment and training services from other programs. For example, some households in which the parents are ineligible based on their immigration status might nonetheless be appropriate for food stamp employment and training assistance if some children in the household are getting food stamps. These children will benefit, and their need for food assistance will decline, if their parents can increase their earnings.

Because this fund is limited, however, we have retained the current prohibition on spending these funds in ways that effectively supplant funding available through the TANF block grant. The Food Stamp Employment and Training Program should be the funder of last resort for these programs.

We remain committed, however, to serving people subject to the three-month time limit. Unlike other applicants and recipients, these individuals cannot receive the food assistance they need unless they have the opportunity to work it off. The legislation requires USDA to give particular attention to this population when allocating the money among states. States that have elected to serve large numbers of unemployed childless adults should continue to have the resources to do so.

This change will expand states' ability to provide employment and training services that do not meet the definition of a work activity in the part of the law creating the 3-month time limit. These could include routine unsupervised job search activities and training programs lasting less than twenty hours per week. Months spent in these activities usually will not count as months of work for purposes of the 3-month time limit, but they may nonetheless help the individuals in question find private-sector employment. States already have broad authority to decide how to coordinate these various employment-related requirements under the act. This change will give them the funding flexibility to take advantage of that authority.

The conference report does not include Senate-passed provisions modifying the 3-month time limit. A major factor in this decision was our examination of the common-sense regulations USDA promulgated last year. We may want to revisit this provision of the law at some point in the future, but USDA reduced the urgency of that with the series of pragmatic and fair-minded choices it made.

The final bill does, however, eliminate the current \$25 cap on the amount states may reimburse E&T participants for expenses other than dependent care. This cap was unreason-

ably limiting states' flexibility in designing their own programs. We expect USDA will continue its longstanding policy of giving states broad flexibility in how they provide these funds to participants. With states paying half of the cost, we have no need to impose federal paperwork burdens on States and households.

My own state of Texas was one of the first to issue food stamp benefits to households through electronic benefit transfer, or EBT, rather than paper coupons. The first generation of EBT contracts have begun to expire, and we are close to having a nationwide system of providing food stamp benefits via EBT. It therefore seems appropriate to take stock of the current system and some of the challenges that it present both to states and clients.

This legislation requires USDA to issue a report on the current status of EBT. I am particularly interested in what information the Department can share on ensuring that claimants have full access to EBT systems and on ensuring that those systems fully meet their obligation to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Rehabilitation Act. It is not acceptable to have eligible, needy individuals effectively denied food stamps because they lack the physical or mental skills necessary to use the equipment in a safe and reliable manner.

The final bill does not include a Senate-passed provision to ensure that no households' EBT benefits are taken "off-line" or made inaccessible unless the household has left them idle for at least 6 months. I was comfortable with this decision because the Department has informed us that it is already planning to implement this policy via regulation.

I am pleased that this legislation will restore eligibility to legal immigrants. We were very fortunate to work with the administration, the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, the Congressional Black Caucus and many other members of Congress on this proposal. Legal immigrants' eligibility for food stamps was severely restricted in 1996, causing significant harm to these families. Many of these families contain poor citizen children who have left the food stamp program since the passage of the welfare law despite remaining eligible. We assume that this is because their parents have been confused about who in their family is eligible.

This bill would restore eligibility to qualified low-income legal immigrant children regardless of their entry date into the United States. In addition, qualified legal immigrant adults who have lived in the United States for 5 or more years with that status also are eligible. We decided to make these adults subject to sponsor deeming because the rules USDA implemented last year strike us as a sensible, equitable approach to balancing our desire not to provide food stamps to families that are being supported by their sponsors with the program's purpose of getting food to those in need. We do not expect USDA to make any changes in this area. In particular, these families should not be subjected to any additional paperwork requirements that may prove difficult to meet if the sponsor is uncooperative.

This restoration would bring food stamp policy for adults into conformity with the rules already in force in Medicaid and TANF. In each of the three programs, an adult becomes eligible for benefits 5 years after obtaining a qualified status. It does not matter if the immigrant

at one time was granted one qualified status, such as asylum, and now has another, such as legal permanent residency. The 5 years begin to run from the time the immigrant first obtained qualified status. This conformity should make these rules much simpler for states to administer and for immigrants to understand. Finally, the legislation would allow legal immigrants receiving benefits under specified disability-based programs to qualify for food stamps.

When we received cost estimates of this package from CBO and the administration on this proposal, neither projected any offsetting collections from sponsors as a result of immigrants receiving food stamps. This seems reasonable since so many low-income immigrants live with their sponsors. Over the years, Congress has consistently rejected proposals to require food stamp recipients to repay properly issued food stamp benefits. The OMB and CBO scores show that those agencies recognize that sponsor liability has never been intended as an end-run around that principle. No sponsor should incur a debt for food stamps that he or she receives along with the sponsored immigrants. The impact of this restoration would be compromised severely if eligible immigrants feared that their family members would be sent a bill as a result of their participation in the food stamp program.

This scoring guided our thinking in how to draft the proposals. Certainly, we do not intend to encourage affluent sponsors to abdicate their responsibilities. But we also do not intend for low-income sponsors who are a part of the food stamp household or family unit to incur a liability as a result of their family's or household member's participating in the food stamp program. How could an aunt who is also her nephew's sponsor elect to enroll that child in food stamps if it would simply result in the aunt receiving a bill for the value of those food stamps?

The bill also includes an important benefit improvement for all low-income households. The food stamp standard deduction, which operates like the standard deduction in the Tax Code, has been improved. First, the standard deduction will now be scaled to household size. Instead of a flat \$134 deduction for all households, households will receive a deduction equal to 8.31 percent of that year's federal poverty guidelines. States must implement this provision by October 1, 2002. We understand that this effective date will represent a challenge for many states because it will require reprogramming their computer systems within a short period of time. We encourage USDA to work with states to provide some leeway for those states that are working diligently towards implementation but who may not be able to achieve the October 1 deadline. Of course, current law protect all states from quality control errors as a result of this provision for 6 months after the effective date.

One of the most profound reforms to the food stamp program included in the bill is the new direction for the quality control system. There has been longstanding agreement amongst states, antihunger groups, and the administration that the quality control system needs to be reformed. The reforms included in this bill will ease federal-state relations and allow state administrators to adopt a balanced approach to program administration. Payment accuracy will remain essential, but not to the exclusion of the program's basic goals. While

continuing the program's commitment to payment accuracy, the new formula will restrict sanctions to the worst offenders, as recommended by the National Academy of Science's review of the quality control system.

The new system eliminates the feature of current law that puts about half of the states in sanction each year. This will allow USDA to focus its energies on states with persistent payment accuracy problems. Under the new system, the threshold for sanction is increased to exclude states with error rates very near the national average from fiscal penalties. In addition, states whose measured error rate may exceed the threshold only due to statistical uncertainty are exempt from sanction. Finally, no action is taken against states in the first year they exceed the threshold; these states are given an opportunity to improve their performance before they are subject to a penalty.

If USDA determines with statistical confidence that a state has triggered a sanction by exceeding the threshold in a second consecutive year, USDA has three choices.

First, it can require the state to reinvest up to 50 percent of the sanction to improve administration of the program. The legislation is deliberately open-ended about what kinds of program improvements can be the goals of reinvestment efforts. We believe each state is likely to be the best judge of what improvements it needs. Current USDA policy sensibly allows reinvestments seeking to improve program access as well as those that seek to improve payment accuracy.

Second, USDA can designate up to 50 percent of state's potential liability to be held at risk. The state must pay moneys held at risk from the previous year if the state's error again is subject to sanction. If the state is not subject to sanction in the following year, the amount held at risk is automatically waived.

Thus, the state would not pay any sanctions unless it exceeded the threshold for sanctions for the third consecutive year, determined again in a statistically reliable manner. USDA cannot collect sanctions during the year in which they are applied.

Finally, USDA can waive any portion of the sanction amount. Any sanctions that are not reinvested or held at risk must be waived. USDA should consider the causes of the state agency's problems and whether the state's error rate is falling along with other relevant factors when determining how much to waive of a state's sanction to waive. Where the state is clearly on the road to correcting its problem, even a complete waiver may make sense.

The final bill does not include an important feature of the Senate-passed bill, adjustments to sanctions for states doing a particularly good job of serving low-wage working families or immigrant households. Since 1998, USDA has adjusted the sanction liabilities of states to eliminate the impact of high or rising proportions of working poor households or low-income immigrants. Last year, the Department wrote to the states to assure them that it would continue to make these adjustments. USDA informs us that it has done so again with regard to states' error rates in fiscal year 2001. USDA reiterated to us its pledge to continue making these adjustments so that no state is thrown into sanction, or has its sanction increased, because it is serving a high or rising proportion of immigrants or earners. With USDA taking this action through its administrative authority, we saw no need to in-

cluded in adjustments in the statutory changes to the system.

I must confess to some nervousness about the timetable for implementing this new system. On the one hand, the current system would remain in place for the current fiscal year. I hope USDA will apply its broad discretion to waive the sanctions of states estimated to exceed the sanction threshold by small or statistically unreliable margins as these states would not be sanctioned under the new system.

More significantly, under this legislation no state would be subject to automatic sanctions in fiscal year 2003, no matter how seriously and chronically it had failed to meet our payment accuracy goals. By extension, fiscal year 2004 could count as no more than a second year for states, even those with serious problems in 2002 and before. I fear this one-time relaxation in QC sanctions could lead to an unacceptable increase in the national payment error rate. None of us have any desire to yield back any of the hard-won gains of recent years.

Neither our bill nor the Senate's provided for gaps of this nature. We adopted this timetable solely at the suggestion of the Department. We trust that the Department will use its broad authority to sanction ineffective or inefficient program administration in the case of any state whose payment accuracy performance during this transition is seriously flawed. The Department must bear the responsibility of ensuring that this lengthy transition that it has requested does not undermine the program's integrity.

The legislation that gives USDA new authority to penalize those states that appeal their quality control error rate findings and that lose their appeal. This is provided to ensure that USDA is not barraged with patently frivolous appeals. Since states cannot be made fully whole for reinvested moneys that ultimately are found not to be owing, a state with a good faith dispute over a sanction could reasonably wait to begin reinvestment until its appeal is resolved. USDA should not deny these states the opportunity to reinvest any sanctions ultimately found due.

The bill also replaces the current system of enhanced funding for states with extremely low error rates with a system of high performance bonuses. The criteria upon which USDA awards these bonuses should reflect a balanced picture of the goals of state administration of the program. Payment accuracy is an important part of that system, but so are complying with the law's application processing deadlines and its requirements to make food assistance accessible to those in need. Measures focusing on administrative service, such as timeliness and denying only those applicant households that are ineligible, should be a significant portion of the bonus package. By requiring USDA to consult with states in developing its system of bonus payments, we by no means intend to suggest that USDA may exclude academics, claimants' advocates, and others from its consultations on this issue.

In conclusion, with this legislation, Congress will improve benefits for many of our nation's neediest families and accomplish historic simplification of the food stamp program, better enabling states to serve working families with this critical work support.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

(Mr. NUSSLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, no farm bill is perfect, but this conference report deserves our support. I will support it.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a list of the groups we have heard from just today in support of the bill.

National Cattlemen's Beef Association
South East Dairy Farmers Association
National Milk Producers Federation
The Alliance of Western Milk Producers
National Pork Producers Council
United Egg Producers
Alliance for Agricultural Conservation
National Association of Wheat Growers
Coalition for Food Aid
Food Research and Action Center
National Farmers Union
United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association
National Cotton Council
Renewable Fuels Association
National Corn Growers Association
Land O'Lakes
American Farm Bureau Federation
USA Rice Federation
National Grain Sorghum Producers
American Sheep Industry Association
Dairy Farmers of America
American Beekeeping Federation
U.S. Apple Association
American Sugar Alliance
American Sugarbeet Growers Association
U.S. Beet Sugar Association
American Sugarcane League
Florida Sugarcane League
Rio Grande Valley Sugar Growers Inc.
Hawaii Sugar Farmers
Sugar Cane Growers Cooperative of Florida
Illinois Corn Growers Association
National Barley Growers Association
National Sunflower Association
USA Dry Pea and Lentil Council
U.S. Canola Association
American Soybean Association
US Rice Producers Association
CoBank
Independent Community Bankers of America
National Association of Conservation Districts
National Association of State Foresters
Ducks Unlimited
Center on Budget and Policy Priorities
Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation
Ducks Unlimited
International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies
National Rifle Association
Pheasants Forever
Quail Unlimited
The Wildlife Society
Wildlife Management Institute

Mr. Speaker, I heard concerns about how our trading partners to the south, our trading partners to the north, our trading partners in Europe may be looking at this. Mr. Speaker, this is a farm bill for rural America. This is not

for rural Mexico, this is not for rural Canada, this is not for rural Europe.

I would also call to the attention of my colleagues, in the motion to recommit it mentions that parts of the money would go to conservation programs, parts of money would go to nutrition programs, parts of the money would go to rural development programs, parts of the money would go to energy programs. So for my conservative colleagues that think that this spends too much money, it does not change the spending; it simply puts it somewhere else.

Also, it may be great language for a recommit motion, but I would encourage my friends to read the conservation title, the nutrition title, the rural development title and the energy title. Those all have extensive programs. The decision of where that would go would take, I feel, a great deal of time, having spent the last 2 months working through a conference.

I would also say you do not create a conference report of this magnitude in a vacuum. Anytime you make a change in one area, you make substantive change somewhere else. It may be easy on the floor to say well, we could just do this and then move on.

That is simply not possible. It would take a tremendous amount of time to go back in and look at the programs that are in place that are based upon the conference report as was reported. It would take extensive amounts of time to go back in and try to rebalance those. We would have to look at all of the conservation payment limitations that are in fact in place. We would have to look at the payment limitations in other areas, such as the farmland protection areas. All this would take considerable time.

Mr. Speaker, we do not have the time. We are out of time. And let there be no doubt about it, if the motion to recommit passes, this conference report is dead. We will be back to writing a new program under a new budget score. And if we think it was difficult to write this over 2½ years, I cannot even imagine the difficulty in writing a new one.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the intensity of all of the Members who have participated today. This is a day that I have looked forward to for 2½ years.

I include the following:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,

Washington, DC, March 7, 2002.

Hon. LARRY COMBEST,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
Longworth Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We have reviewed the Senate amendment to H.R. 2646, the Farm Security Act of 2001, which is now before the Conference Committee. Under rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has jurisdiction over "pollution of navigable waters." Certain provisions of the Senate Amendment to H.R. 2646 fall within that jurisdiction, including:

Section 203—This section amends section 1243 of the Food Security Act of 1985 to au-

thorize funding for, among other things, meeting the purpose of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Section 213—This section amends section 1240 of the Food Security Act of 1985 to include as a purpose, assisting livestock producers in complying with the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Section 262—This section establishes a Klamath Basin Interagency Task Force that includes the Environmental Protection Agency, and includes as a duty, using existing Federal programs in the Klamath Basin for "improvement of water quality." Existing federal programs for the improvement of water quality in the Klamath basin are programs under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Our Committee recognizes the importance of this legislation and the need to conclude the conference expeditiously. While we have a valid claim to jurisdiction over the provisions outlined above, I have not asked that the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee be named Conferees. This is conditional on our mutual understanding that we are not waiving any jurisdiction over these or any similar provisions and that you work with us to resolve any concerns we may have about them.

I would also appreciate it if you would have this letter and your response inserted into the Record when the Conference Report on the legislation is considered on the Floor.

I look forward to working with you on this matter and thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

DON YOUNG,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, March 13, 2002.

Hon. DON YOUNG,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Rayburn HOB, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN YOUNG: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2646, the Farm Security Act of 2001, which is now before the Conference Committee. I look forward to working with you on items within your jurisdiction in order to complete this important legislation in an expeditious manner.

Recognizing your Committee's jurisdiction under House Rule X, with respect to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, I appreciate your cooperation in not seeking the appointment of conferees. I agree that your decision to forego the appointment to the Conference Committee will not prejudice the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with respect to its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar matters and I look forward to working with you to resolve the issues at hand.

I greatly appreciate your cooperation in this matter and I will insert a copy of our exchange of letters in the Congressional Record during consideration of the Conference Report.

Sincerely,

LARRY COMBEST,
Chairman.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report for the farm bill. Overall, I think this is a good bill and I thank the conferees for their hard work.

This bill makes significant improvements to our current farm policy, which has not worked as promised to help American farmers. This bill will restore counter-cyclical payments to provide support to farmers when market prices for a commodity drop below a target price, restoring the safety net that was cut with the 1996 Freedom to Farm Act. In addition, the bill

reauthorizes the existing programs that provides fixed annual payments and marketing loans to commodity producers and continues the planting flexibility that came out of the Freedom to Farm Act.

The bill also provides a significant increase in funding for conservation programs, such as the Conservation Reserve Program and the Wetlands Reserve Program. These programs are very important to the farmers in the Congressional District I represent, and I am glad to see that there will be adequate funding for the expansion of these key programs.

I am also pleased that the conference report includes \$405 million for energy-related programs, including the Commodity Credit Corporation bio-energy program. This program pays producers who purchase commodities for the purpose of producing biodiesel and fuel-grade ethanol. Illinois is the largest producer of ethanol, and the continuation of this program is good news for our farmers.

Mr. Speaker, overall I believe that this is good legislation, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill to help America's farmers.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I have no choice but to oppose the conference report before us today. I agree that there are some excellent provisions. I support the increase in spending for conservation, as well as the country-of-origin labeling and research subsidies. I also support the restoration of food stamps for legal immigrants, and indeed, have voted numerous times during my tenure to support restoration of food stamp benefits to legal immigrants.

But I cannot in good conscience vote for this bloated bill. What we hope will come out of a conference is a well-reasoned and reasonable compromise. In reality, the end result is frequently an agreement to split the difference. Today, we are presented with an even less appealing compromise—an agreement that is completely out of proportion to the requests of either the House or Senate bill. This is hugely irresponsible in a time of economic duress and budget shortfalls.

It is the sins of omissions that are the downfall of this bill. I am sorely disappointed to see that the conferees chose to ignore the will of the House and of the Senate and not implement the recommended subsidy payment limitations. The result would cost this country billions of dollars while benefiting the largest corporate farms and big agro-business. This does not help the small farmer. In fact, these huge handouts would aid corporate farms in buying out the small farmers the bill purports to protect.

And there are other glaring omissions. Gone are the provisions that would improve animal welfare. Many important conservation measures have been gutted. As a percentage of the total, the conservation portion is actually less than it was in the 1990 Farm Bill.

For these reasons, I oppose this conference report. The bill represents a missed opportunity and it is a failure.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 2646. I want to commend the Chairman and Ranking Member of the House Committee on Agriculture and the Chairman and Ranking Member from the other body for their hard work in getting this bill through conference.

The Committee on International Relations also has a substantial interest in H.R. 2646,

as the Committee has jurisdiction on trade and export programs as well as international food aid, all of which we addressed in Committee consideration of Title III.

The conference report strikes an appropriate balance between international food aid programs and trade promotion. I am pleased to note that the report also preserves the reforms to the Food for Peace authorities in substantially the same form as the Committee's recommendation and contains further reforms for the Food for Progress suggested by the Senate.

By strengthening our international food aid programs, this bill helps to ensure that tens of thousands of hungry men, women and children do not starve to death simply because they were born in a country with chronic food shortages, civil war or poor governance.

While U.S. food aid programs authorized by the bill before us today cannot end world hunger, they can play a crucial role in helping our nation meet its moral obligation to alleviate human suffering in places like sub-Saharan Africa, the Middle East and South Asia while at the same time help to support thousands of American farm families. As we have seen, suffering and despair can often be manipulated and turned into a breeding ground for evil and hate.

I am also very pleased that we have been able to include two new but very important provisions. This bill will permanently authorize the Global Food for Education Initiative launched by Ambassador George McGovern and former Senator Bob Dole, and provides \$100 million in bridge funding for the pilot program while additional funding is being identified.

The second provision is the Farmers for Africa and the Caribbean initiative, first introduced by Congresswoman EVA CLAYTON as H.R. 1894 which will help bring American farming expertise to the countries that most need it through farmer to farmer type programs.

This legislation will also increase American agricultural exports, which support thousands of farm families around our nation. Considering that agricultural exports account for nearly one fourth of all farm income, it is vital that we continue to support or trade promotion programs.

Mr. Speaker, these programs epitomize the true American spirit and the values we hold dear. Through these programs, we are able to take the bounty of our lands and share it with the needy and the hungry around the world. At the same time, we are able to help sustain the family farms and help producers and growers expand their markets. It is no wonder that these programs enjoy such widespread support.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the tremendous work by the staff on the Committee on International Relations on this legislation. In particular, I would like to pay tribute to Nisha Desai and Paul Oostburg, without whom essential issues relating to U.S. international food aid would have been far less robust than the bill before the floor today. People around the world owe them their thanks.

I hope that all of my colleagues will support the conference report.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with much disappointment that the animal protection provisions once included in the Farm Bill were stripped out during conference committee.

As a long-time champion of animal rights, I have been a cosponsor of The Downed Animal Protection Act, The Bear Protection Act, the ban on cockfighting, and similar pieces of legislation since my early days in Congress. And with each year that they are introduced and re-introduced, the House comes closer and closer to passing them, but yet we always fall short. The Farm Bill was the best vehicle in recent memory for finally having these protections signed into law. But, alas, we find ourselves back at square one.

Despite this missed opportunity, I ultimately decided to support the Farm Bill because it contains several positive provisions that will greatly benefit many of my constituents. The Nutritional Title within the bill is one of the most important pieces of food stamp legislation in 25 years. It invests almost \$7 billion over ten years in crucial improvements in the program, including a restoration of benefits to all documented immigrant children and to immigrant adults who have resided in the country for five years. The bill also provides families with transitional food stamps as they leave welfare and move into jobs, making the difficult transition much more stable.

In addition, the Farm Bill includes \$275 million for the Watershed Rehabilitation Program which will provide much-needed resources to protect and preserve the New York City Watershed. The bill also contains provisions that will be beneficial for fruit and vegetable growers and dairy farmers in Upstate New York.

While I am pleased that the Farm Bill made vital improvements in the Food Stamp Program and invested in important agriculture initiatives, I do not approve of the conferees' decision to strip out the animal rights protections. It is my sincere hope that Congress will quickly revisit and implement these crucial protections that have been put off for far too long.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, as I've traveled across Northeast Iowa and listened to members of the agricultural community over the last few years, the shape and the content of the new farm bill has been the centerpiece of our discussions. I've heard from many farmers about the challenges they face, their preferences for this legislation and their hopes for a quick resolution.

I voted for the original Freedom to Farm legislation in 1996. Freedom to Farm was working until the United States fell prey to a trade war, a currency collapse and substantially subsidized overproduction in South America. Accordingly, as Chairman of the House Budget Committee, I constructed the fiscal year 2002 and fiscal year 2003 budgets to set aside necessary funding. I did this so Congress could write a new farm program as soon as possible to meet these challenges farmers have faced since the implementation of Freedom to Farm.

As Chairman of the Budget committee, I am pleased that the conference agreement fits within the amounts assumed for reauthorization of a farm bill within the fiscal year 2002 budget resolution. Our budget resolution accommodated these amounts by establishing a 302(a) allocation for the Committee on Agriculture for fiscal year 2002 that could be used at the committee's discretion for emergency relief or reauthorization of a farm bill. It set aside the rest in a reserve fund that can only be used for reauthorization of the farm bill.

Our budget resolution also allocated \$7.35 billion in fiscal year 2002 and \$73.5 billion

over the period of fiscal years 2002 to 2011. According to the Congressional Budget Act, bills may not exceed the appropriate levels in the budget resolution. This conference agreement meets this standard. Chairman COMBEST, Ranking Member STENHOLM, and their staffs have worked hard to ensure that this bill complies within the Budget Committee guidelines and I recommend them for this.

Farmers needed and deserved a farm bill last year to adequately prepare for 2002 crops. I believe allowing this debate to go so long was irresponsible and unsympathetic to the challenges Iowa's farmers face each crop year.

I am extremely disappointed that the final conference agreement failed to include a ban on packer ownership of livestock. Because I realized how critical it is for Iowa's livestock producers, I introduced separate legislation on this issue in February. The leaders of the conference committee promised to continue investigating packer ownership of livestock and its effects on producers. I plan to remind them of that promise and will pursue every avenue remaining to find a solution.

My second major concern about the conference agreement is that it fails to address payment limitations in a meaningful manner.

I fear the lack of these two provisions will drive more family farmers in Iowa to experience the harmful effects of consolidation in the marketplace.

I am also concerned about the new Conservation Security Program included in the final bill. As a new, unproven entitlement program, it potentially takes dollars away from conservation programs that have proven successful in the past such as the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP). We will need to closely monitor the effects of this initiative.

While the conference agreement is clearly far from perfect, I believe there are numerous strengths that must be considered as well.

The overall package placed before us today is an improvement over the status quo when it comes to the support and safety net the Iowa farmers have requested. That is precisely what I provided funding in my budget to accomplish, and that is why I voted to approve the conference report.

Overall, the new farm bill provides necessary stability for agriculture by maintaining planting flexibility and implementing counter-cyclical payments to help farmers deal with poor weather conditions and unfavorable market conditions.

I am very pleased that his legislation includes much needed funds for rural development including rural business investment, emergency personnel and firefighters and high speed internet access for rural areas.

This legislation also includes important provisions for the improvement of trade for Iowa's farmers. The legislation includes funding for the Market Assistance Program as well as the Foreign Market Development Cooperator Program. I am also pleased that this legislation include a National Dairy Program intended to help all dairy producers and significantly increases conservation programs, an 80 percent increase over Freedom to Farm.

While a new farm program is indeed the centerpiece for a prosperous future for Iowa's farmers, further action is still necessary to ensure a strong and healthy agricultural economy. We must continue to press for better

trade agreements, including the approval of Trade Promotion Authority for the President. Agriculture also deserves improved treatment under the tax code. Opportunities also exist to benefit farmers in pending energy legislation and regulatory relief.

While one size will never fit all when it comes to agricultural legislation, the Farm Security Act provides the support and safety net that Iowa farmers have asked for. As such, I vote to approve the Farm Security Act.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant but real opposition to the Conference Report for H.R. 2646, the Farm security Act.

My opposition is reluctant because I do think Congress should enact a new farm bill this year, to establish sound policies for agriculture and to do such essential things as the extension and expansion of the food stamps program and further the use of renewable sources of energy.

But my opposition is real because this conference report not only falls short of the ideal—as does most legislation—but also fails the fundamental tests of fairness and responsible public policy.

In 1996, Congress passed the Freedom to Farm Act. I was not a Member of Congress at that time, but I understand its basic purpose was to allow more flexibility to farmers to plant different crops depending on market demands. It was also supposed to reduce government involvement in farming and save taxpayers money.

It seems clear to me that experience since 1996 has shown that the legislation needed revision—but this bill goes far beyond a mere revision. Instead, the principles of the 1996 legislation have been abandoned, and now we are faced with a farm bill that increases spending by more than \$73 billion dollars.

The Commodity Title of this bill, which is supposed to provide farmers with "security," is seriously flawed. First off it provides government payments to only a few commodity producers, those who produce corn, rice, wheat, cotton, soybeans, sorghum, barley and oats. And even for those producers it is structured so that it will provide the most subsidies to the largest producers. As a result, the small family farmers will get a little government assistance, while some of the largest farms will receive the bulk of the subsidies. In my opinion, this is not the way to really provide security for America's farm families or to stabilize commodity prices in a sustainable way. Instead, this title will encourage farmers to overproduce the favored commodities because they are guaranteed a price for their crop, and taxpayers will make up the difference between the set price and the market price.

Equally important, the conference report's conservation provisions are simply inadequate.

There are a number of farmer conservation programs that have had a history of success that are authorized by the farm bill. The biggest problem with these programs is that they have been underfunded and many farmers who qualify and want to participate in these programs can't. The House farm bill provided \$1.6 billion for these programs and the Senate bill provided \$2.4 billion. But the Conference report only provides \$1.4 billion for these programs. This bill does not go far enough with these conservation programs that farmers support.

So, while the conference report does have some provisions that deserve support—from

school lunch programs, to WIC—overall it does not deserve enactment.

Farmers need some sort of security program to protect them from poor weather conditions, rapid price fluctuations, disease, and other perils. They need security, but this bill does not do that. This bill will have Colorado taxpayers—including both farmers and consumers—pay out more money to subsidize out of state farmers than Colorado farmers and the environment will receive in benefits.

We need a better bill to provide security to all farmers.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, American agriculture now stands at a crossroads. The question that we as a society have to answer is do we want an agricultural system that is comprised of very few, very large corporate producers—probably owned by one of the largest supermarket chains and probably overseas—or do we want a decentralized system of family based agriculture that produces food in rural communities across the nation.

Foe me, the answer is clear. We need to support and preserve family based agriculture throughout the Nation in all commodities. Why do I say this? Why should Americans care that their food is produced overseas on large corporate farms? While overseas producers are not as efficient as US farmers, they are in many cases lower cost producers because the cost of land and labor are, to excuse the pun, dirt cheap. And the health and safety standards and environmental standards are far more lax than ours, if they exist at all. So, Americans may get food that is produced more cheaply overseas. But is that the only consideration that should dictate the shape of American agriculture. I don't think so. For a host of reasons it is increasingly clear that corporate controlled farming is bad for the Nation.

First, I consider the preservation of the family farm a question of national security. Everyone in this room will agree that we are far too dependent on foreign oil. With all the troubles today in the Middle East we see how vulnerable our economy is to foreign upheavals over which we have little or no control. In 1991, when Iraq invaded Kuwait, this nation went to war quickly in order to protect our oil supply from the Middle East. How vulnerable will we be if we become dependent on foreign nations for our food?

Secondly, small decentralized farms are important for our environment. When farming is spread out it has less impact on the environment. In addition, family farms help reduce the blight of suburban sprawl that is gobbling up so much open space in this country.

Thirdly, family farming is an integral and critical part of our rural economy. They support not only their own families, but also a host of related businesses like feed stores, equipment dealers, and local retailers. They also maintain the scenic landscape that is so important for the tourist industry in Vermont and elsewhere.

Finally, consumers are ultimately the winners when food is produced on family run farms across the country. As I mentioned earlier, one of the reasons that American farmers can be undersold is that we have some of the highest food safety standards in the world. While that makes our food more expensive to produce, it also means that American consumers can be more certain that the food they are buying is high quality and safe for their families. And as for the cheaper cost of production overseas, consumers are unlikely to

benefit. Consolidation in the retailing and processing industry means that lower cost food from overseas is more likely to provide increased profits for them rather than lower consumer prices.

Those are just some of the reasons that, in my view, we need to promote a system of family based agriculture. But as you know that trends are currently against those of us that support family farmers. In 1950, there were 5,388,437 farms in the U.S. By 1997, that number had fallen to 1,911,859. That's a loss of 3,476,578. Or to put it another way, in just 47 years, almost two-thirds of the farms in the U.S. had vanished.

But while farms were getting fewer, they were also getting bigger. The average farm in 1950 was 216 acres. By 1997, the size of the average farm had more than doubled to 487 acres.

Just as troubling and perhaps more troubling for farmers is that the people who buy their product—namely the processors and retailers—have become larger and larger to the point that they have far, far too much control over the price that farmers get for their milk.

In 2000, the top five food retailers controlled 42% of retail sales in the U.S. This represents a staggering fast consolidation because the top five retailers in 1993 only controlled 20% of food sales and as late as 1997 the top five only controlled 24% of food sales.

The same is true among dairy processors. As of 2000, the top four dairy processors controlled 35% of the fluid milk market. That's over a 34% increase in only 2 years.

And regionally, control is even more concentrated. Although Suiza entered the dairy processing industry in 1993, by 2000 it controlled 70% of fluid milk processing and distribution in 13 Northeastern states.

This consolidation is not limited to dairy, it is happening in every agricultural commodity. The top four beef packers control 81% of the market. Among pork packers, the top four control 59%. The top three corn exporters control 81% of their market. Those top three corn exporters also are the top three soybean exporters and they control 65% of that market.

In a business environment like this, family farmers are getting squeezed harder and harder as fewer and fewer buyers control the marketplace. It's true for dairy, it's true for apples, it's true for commodities across the spectrum.

This imbalance in the marketplace and this consolidation in the among producers is being accelerated by the increased amounts of foreign trade in agricultural products.

In 2000, the U.S. was importing enough cheese and dairy ingredients to replace some 10.6 billion pounds of domestic milk production. The U.S. exported the equivalent of 4.3 billion pounds. That's a trade deficit of 6.3 billion pounds of milk.

And this pattern is going to get worse as processors and retailers look to cheaper sources of food to fatten their profit margins.

In fact, a 2001 report from the University of Missouri noted that if there was completely free trade in dairy, the world milk price would always be lower than the U.S. cost of production. This led the researchers to conclude, and I quote, "If the dairy lobby is successful in opening up global trade through the World Trade Organization (WTO), we will find most of the remaining 90,000 US dairy farms exiting rapidly." What an absolute tragedy that would be.

Now if you agree with me that America needs family farmers; and if you agree with me that we, at a minimum, need to protect small farmers from the increasing power of the concentrated processing and retailing sectors, what should we do?

What we need to do is make sure that we have agricultural policies that protect, promote and empower family farmers in this country. That means for a start that we do not put American farmers at the mercy of world milk prices.

We also need a federal agricultural policy that doesn't focus its help on large farms. Under the failed 1996 so-called "Freedom to Farm" program, only 40% of farmers in the US received subsidies. 60% did not. The top ten percent received 70% of the subsidies. Fifty percent of farmers received only 2%. Companies like DuPont, Archers Daniel Midland, Boise Cascade and others have received hundreds of thousands of dollars.

I am therefore disappointed that the payment caps I voted to support and that the Senate included in its version of the farm bill were not included in the final bill. As the votes demonstrated, there is majority support in both bodies of Congress for this provision.

However, even though the payment caps were excluded, as were other positive proposals, this Farm Bill represents a major victory for family dairy farmers in Vermont and across this country. When the Northeast Dairy Compact expired last fall, family farmers in New England were left at the mercy of the outrageously low \$9.90 support price. I am also pleased to say that the entire Vermont delegation pulled out all the stops to extend and expand the Compact. But we were opposed by the dairy processors, who were working with large producers in the West, and Congresspeople from the Upper Midwest who, mistakenly in my view, thought the Compact hurt their farmers.

Last October, I introduced an amendment on the floor of the House to create a national dairy program that would provide family dairy farmers across the country with benefits equal to what New England dairy farmers received under the Compact. We were opposed by the top Republican and the top Democrat on the Agriculture Committee, both of whom are from Texas. Much to everyone's surprise, we received 194 votes after just two weeks of organizing. Much of the credit for the strong showing that this amendment received goes to colleagues from the Midwest and the South who joined with myself and other Northeastern members in support of this national plan. It is fair to say that without the courage and leadership of those Midwestern and Southern Members was critical to our success.

Vermont's Senators then took that concept into the Senate where a version was included in the Senate bill. Now the House and Senate conferees have completed working out the differences between the House and Senate versions of the Farm Bill and the final version includes a new national dairy program that will accomplish what we have been fighting.

The new national program would provide virtually the same benefits as did the Compact with the difference being that the money would come from the Federal Government as opposed to the processors. Now I, as much as anyone, want the processors to have to pay a fair price for their product. But without the Compact, family dairy farmers in Vermont and

across this country need this safety net. My hope is that in years to come we can shift the funding source back where it belongs, on the processors so that farmers are getting their money from the market. But it makes no sense to let thousands of family farmers go out of business while we work to make that happen. This program will also help make sure that farm subsidy payments are more evenly distributed across the country. Right now, the vast majority of the money goes to the Midwestern and Southern states who produce program crops.

Of course, that Federal Government has much more to do if we are to save family farming in this country. In addition to making sure federal ag policy benefits small farmers, we have to address the concentration issue among processors and retailers by enforcing our current antitrust laws and perhaps enacting new ones if current law doesn't offer enough protections.

The road ahead for family agriculture is not going to be an easy one. But farmers will not have to fight it alone. There are millions and millions of Americans who do not live on farms or in rural communities who understand the value—from a national security standpoint, from an environmental standpoint, from an economic standpoint, from a consumer standpoint—of decentralized family based agriculture in the country. They will be your allies. At the same time, farmers have to realize that the corporate, agribusiness interests are the opponents of family-based agriculture. They need to be cut loose so that, for example when they want outrageous free trade agreements that allow them to purchase agricultural products overseas at a fraction of the U.S. price, family farmers all over this country stand up and say no. It will be a tough fight but together we can reshape American agriculture for the better.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, we have done a tremendous job fixing our system of social welfare, and the reforms have been a tremendous success in my district and across the nation. We did the heavy lifting in 1996 and we will reauthorize those reforms later this year.

I find it extremely troubling that our Nation's agricultural policies seem to follow a philosophy completely opposite that of our social policies: a hand out, not a hand up. At the same time we're preparing to strengthen our social welfare reforms, we're completely repealing any semblance of agricultural reform.

This Farm Bill will bring our total agricultural spending to \$208 billion over 10 years. It not only perpetuates crop subsidy programs, it virtually doubles them. It represents business-as-usual for our nation's heavily-subsidized agriculture community.

Our Nation's agriculture policy is possibly the most disgraceful aspect of the entire federal government. If I had my way, I would scrap the wasteful, bureaucratic Department of Agriculture and all its programs, and start from scratch! The Department has an astonishing 99,000 full-time employees. By comparison, the Department of Education has just 5,000 employees.

We need to come to grips with the fact that our farms are growing too many crops, which has led commodity prices to plummet. Yet, in the face of such convincing evidence, we refuse to take any market-oriented approach. Instead, we will be exacerbating the problem by providing even more subsidies, thereby encouraging marginal farmers to continue to

overproduce and send prices further downward. Why is agriculture immune to basic economics? Because, I suspect, America has a romance with the family farm. Farming represents all that is good and pure in America.

This motion is recommit will make two extremely modest improvements to our farm policies. First, it will limit annual farm payments to \$275,000 for a married couple per year. Second, it will shift the money saved by these limits to conservation programs.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this Farm Bill because it continues our failed, wasteful, anti-competitive agriculture policies. I urge my colleagues to vote for the motion to recommit and against the underlying bill.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, for the last 68 days, 11 of my House colleagues and I have worked to resolve differences with our Senate counterparts and finish a farm bill.

The House Agriculture Committee began writing this bill more than two years ago. We held 47 hearings in Washington and across the country, and heard testimony from 368 producers and the organizations that represent them. More than 2,500 farmers and ranchers participated in the process of crafting the House bill, which was approved unanimously by the Committee and was passed last October by the full House with bipartisan support, on a vote of 291–120. This bill reflects a broad effort to respond to the concerns and needs of agricultural producers, rural citizens, and American consumers.

Why this effort to approve a farm bill? Because our farmers need it, rural America deserves it, and our consumers demand it.

The American farmer is the most efficient producer of food and fiber of anyone in the world. For an example of the benefits of agriculture we enjoy in America, let's consider a loaf of bread. I purchased this loaf of bread this morning at my neighborhood grocery store for \$1.69. Each bushel of wheat, for which the farmer receives about \$2.50, yields 65 loaves of bread. That means the farmer receives about \$.04 for each loaf sold—when was the last time you purchased a loaf of bread for 4 cents, the amount actually going to producers? It's easy to see why farmers grow increasingly frustrated by the widening gap between the prices consumers pay and the commodity prices they receive.

There's no doubt that times are tough in farm country. The ag economy continues to suffer the burden of low market prices and rising costs of production, and producers, already squeezed by narrow profit margins, pay the price.

Last month, I completed my 66-country tour and story was the same in each town hall meeting from Alemena to Zurich. Record low prices and poor weather conditions paint a bleak picture for farm families.

This week's headlines in Kansas read: "High Input Costs, Lower Livestock Income Cut Kansas Farm Income 28.6%"; "Bankers Indicate the Farm-related Businesses Continue to Struggle"; and "Falling Prices Mean Big Losses for Cattle Feeders." Average net farm income in Kansas last year totaled less than \$28,000 per farm. Total farm expenses increased 7 percent and average farm debt climbed to 34 percent of assets, up 32 percent from the year before. In 2000, a farmers spent \$81 for every \$100 worth of farm products sold. In 2001, those input costs climbed to \$87 for the same level of market returns.

Even more recently, the market price drops have been dramatic. The breakeven price for the average cattle feeder on May 1 was about \$70 cwt. On April 29, cattle prices were \$62—down from \$73 on March 1, just two months earlier. That means that producers lost around \$120 on every animal they sold. Multiply that number for an individually-owned, 10,000 head feedyard in Ashland, KS, and that feeder has just lost \$1.2 million. These are the stories I heard all across the First District of Kansas.

Our farmers and rural communities need help to survive, and looking at the farm economy over the past 20 years tells why. In 1970, a combine cost \$7,000; today it is \$170,000. Tractors have increased five-fold in price. Fuel was \$.30 per gallon; today it's \$1.30. The amount of seed corn for planting that could be purchased for \$25 in 1972, now costs \$140.

Income, on the other hand, has gone the opposite direction of input costs. In 1973, soybeans sold for \$12 per bushel; yesterday, they were at \$4.28. In 1974, wheat hit \$5 per bushel; yesterday, it was \$2.45.

So it should not come as a surprise when farmers turn to us in desperate times, or send sale bills like this one—with the note inside from a farm wife—"This is the reason we need a decent farm bill! I have a young man, with farming in his blood, eager to take over our ground—Please make it possible for him to continue the family tradition and earn a decent living from the farm to provide for this family."

There are many reasons we need a farm bill, and a farm bill is about much more than just agriculture. It's about maintaining the safest, most abundant, most affordable food supply our consumers expect and deserve. It's about preserving the environment for future generations, conserving natural resources and protecting the quality of our water and air. It's about helping rural communities sustain their economies. It's about ensuring adequate nutrition for all Americans, especially our children.

But for Kansas, it's also about avoiding this headline: "On the Auction Block: Farmers getting out, putting land for sale in tough economic times." This bill is worth \$318 million to the Kansas economy this year alone, to keep farmers on the land, shoppers on Main Street, children in our schools.

If we don't act now, next year may be too late for some family farms. The wheat crop is in the ground, just over a month from the beginning of harvest, and planting is underway for other crops. Farmers need details of a farm bill sooner, not later.

I urge you to support the farm bill and vote for the conference report.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member carefully reviewed the provisions in the conference report for H.R. 2646. Although it contains numerous positive features, in many ways the conference report is disappointing and unimaginative. This Member is also concerned that it will lead to dramatic increases in production, lower farm prices, and thereby will lead to an early exhaustion of the \$73.5 billion increase in funding called for over the next decade.

In making a judgment on the conference report, this Member considered the following positive and negative features of the legislation. Specifically, this Member is pleased that the conference report for H.R. 2646 includes these positive aspects: Provides a counter-cyclical approach which will establish a greater safety net for farmers and should eliminate the

need for annual emergency assistance. This provision is an especially important and positive feature of this legislation.

Retains the planting flexibility, a feature of the current farm program which has been extremely popular with producers.

Although the bill is far from perfect, it does provide additional income assurances for producers.

To the benefit of the sorghum producers of the Great Plains region, the sorghum loan rate is raised to the level of corn.

Gives producers the option to update base acres and yields.

Increases funding for conservation programs by 80 percent. Included in the increase are these positive provisions:

The Conservation Reserve Program acreage is increased from 36.4 million to 39.2 million.

The Wetlands Reserve Program acreage cap is increased to 2.275 million acres.

The Conservation Security Program is established which will provide incentives to maintain and improve stewardship practices.

The Environmental Quality Incentives Program receives an increase from \$200 million to \$1.3 billion annually over the next six years. This program is especially important help for livestock producers in a national effort to protect our environment.

The program for the rehabilitation of aging small watershed structures that have been constructed over the past 50 years is provided \$275 million in funding.

Funding for the Market Access Program is increased to \$200 million annually by 2006.

Funding for the Foreign Market Development (Cooperator) Program is increased from \$27.5 million to \$35 million per year.

An energy title is included and funding is provided to promote ethanol and biodiesel.

Funding is provided for broadband service in rural areas and rural local TV broadcast signal loan guarantees.

Funding is included for value-added agricultural market development grants.

Funding is provided for the Rural Business Investment Program.

The Global Food for Education Initiative (McGovern-Dole) is continued as a pilot program for FY2003.

Commercial airlines are required to carry baby chicks as ordinary mail. While this might seem like a small item, it is very important to a number of Americans, a part of the American farm heritage, and a personal interest of this Member.

However, Mr. Speaker, there are also some very significant deficiencies in this conference report. Among them are the following:

The conferees failed to address the concerns related to increased concentration in the agriculture sector. There is a growing concern which has been consistently expressed to me by constituents in recent years that there is too much concentration of economic power and too little competition on the input, production, and marketing sides of agriculture. Unfortunately, the conference report dropped initiatives designed to address these concerns.

The conferees allowed a disproportionate amount of the funding to go to very large farm operations. There is no real reform of payment limitations and large producers will continue to reap most of the benefits. In the past 5 years, 10 percent of the producers received two-thirds of the payments. This conference report

does little to change that situation. The incentives are in this conference report to cause the big farm operations to get bigger to the detriment of most Nebraska and American family farmers.

The conference report dropped the ban on packer ownership of livestock which the Senate approved, a ban which is also overwhelmingly supported by the great majority of Nebraska farmers and livestock producers.

After balancing the beneficial aspects and deficiencies of this legislation, the conference report for H.R. 2646, this Member has decided to vote "aye" since the measure is an improvement over the status quo.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this Farm Bill Conference Report represents a missed opportunity on many levels to finally redirect agricultural policy to reflect today's realities and respond to tomorrow's challenges. It represents a lost opportunity for taking care of the environment. It is a lost opportunity to provide meaningful assistance to the family farmer. It is a lost opportunity for farmers in Oregon. Since the Farm Bill has so many direct and indirect impacts on urban and rural economies, it also contains other opportunities too numerous to list.

We could have easily done much more. Instead, the Conferees repeatedly ignored the wishes of a majority of Senators and Representatives. They have cloaked their actions in language of concern about family farms and the environment. Yet they repeatedly struck provisions that would have made a meaningful difference to both. A few of the more egregious examples include ignoring Senate and House votes to set reasonable limits on subsidies and provisions agreed to by both the House and Senate to protect and enhance environmental clean up payments to family farms by limiting payments to corporate livestock producers. They dropped the Senate provision to limit overproduction on sensitive lands. The 80 percent "increase" in conservation funding claimed by supporters is misleading. Critical conservation programs are cut by almost \$3 billion from the Senate bill and national conservation priorities are not addressed. The percentage of the farm bill devoted to conservation is actually less than the 1996 Farm Bill.

This farm bill does not help the majority of farmers. Because subsidies increase with the amount of crops produced, this bill benefits primarily the largest agribusinesses. It has been estimated that up to 73 percent of farm subsidies go to just 10 percent of farms, most with annual incomes over \$250,000. The conference report provides little support to the majority of farm families, directing only 12 percent of the funding to the bottom 80 percent of farmers.

This Farm Bill is not good for Oregon. The imbalance of payments maintained in this bill disadvantages states like Oregon, where we don't grow as many commodity program-supported crops as other states. Negotiators dropped key language to address one of the state's most pressing environmental crises in the Klamath Basin. This was a lost opportunity to redirect our farm policy and restore the natural hydrology of the basin and to ensure that all federal agencies were implementing their federal trust responsibility with Native Americans.

An overwhelming majority of the public supports redirecting our agricultural funding to

protecting the environment. In the end, despite all the talk of the importance of conservation this Conference Report will shrink conservation spending as a percentage of total farm spending. As stated by the League of Conservation Voters, "The version of the Farm Bill . . . is a missed opportunity to support meaningful conservation of America's farm lands."

The Conference Report requires taxpayers to foot the bill for helping corporate livestock producers clean up their waste, even though they are already required to do so under the Clean Water Act. Currently, the average payment for the Environmental Quality Incentives Program is only \$9,000 and almost 200,000 applications are left without funding. Instead of directing more funding to clean-up this backlog, the conferees have opened the flood gates for mega producers to expand and divert badly needed money away from small and average size family farms.

While farmers in some states receive over 20 cents for each dollar of product they generate, farmers in significant agricultural states like Oregon, Florida, Pennsylvania, and California receive 3 cents or less. Even though the number of farmland acres lost to sprawl doubled over the last six years, negotiators cut \$1.25 billion out of the only federal program to help farmers curb sprawl. They also failed to adopt Senate language that would have ensured conservation programs work in every state and don't discriminate against farmers and ranchers in areas with high land values, an important provision for my state.

It is a lost opportunity for improving animal welfare. Both the House and the Senate passed important animal rights provisions. Unfortunately, one by one, these provisions have been stripped in conference, against the will of the majority of Members in the House and the Senate. We had the chance to close loopholes that would have limited the barbaric practice of cockfighting already illegal in 47 states and to stop the potential export of these birds across state lines. Instead, the conferees ignored identical language in both the House and Senate bills to impose stiffer penalties on those engaged in illegal transport of these animals across state lines. They also extended the effective date from 30 days to one year giving illegal cockfighters an extra eleven months to continue their practice.

The final bill strikes provisions dealing with downed animals at slaughter facilities. This issue bears on human health as well as animal welfare. It is not healthy to have sick and traumatized animals in the food chain. This conference report represents a lost opportunity for improving food safety and protecting consumers.

This Farm Bill is not good for the taxpayers. Because of how it is structured we won't know for years how expensive this bill will ultimately be. Ironically, much of this cost goes into paying subsidies that create surpluses and further depress crop prices. Stung by the embarrassing revelation about who really benefits from farm payments, House conferees attempted to amend the Freedom of Information Act to hide part of the payment information instead of adopting reasonable limits. Luckily, the Senate language prevailed and the information on all subsidies, which will be more disturbing in the future, will be available to the public.

The conferees turned a blind eye to the recent House vote which passed 265-158 in

favor of the Senate's \$275,000 payment limit and instead today's bill imposes a \$360,000 payment limit that is largely meaningless through its exemptions for large scale agribusiness such as those who participate in rice and cotton certificate programs.

This Farm Bill is not good for tribal governments because the federal government does not fulfill its trust responsibility in regards to Native Americans. Language that passed in the Senate but was dropped by the Conferees that would have authorized a Forest Service assistance program for tribes seeking grants and provided informed and uniform guidance in the Agency's widespread relations with tribes. This was a missed opportunity to promote greater cooperation between the U.S. Forest Service and forest conservation by tribal governments.

Finally, this farm Bill is not good for international trade. U.S. farm subsidies send the wrong message to other regions such as Europe and Japan that have more protectionist policies than we do. We cannot freely compete in those markets and we don't have the moral authority to object when we are subsidizing our farmers. Several provisions of this Farm Bill will qualify as "price-distorting" practices and the World Trade Organization can be expected to impose trade sanctions on American farm products, and this would have a devastating effective on U.S. exports.

Even though we were unsuccessful in the effort to change the Farm Bill and capture many lost opportunities it is now clear that it is past time to modernize our farm policies. I am hopeful that this flawed bill and process nonetheless will help usher in a new era of agricultural support and protection for this new century.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 2646, The Farm Security Act.

First, all Members should support H.R. 2646 because it represents a return to truth in agricultural budgeting. In 1996, Congress approved the Freedom to Farm Act, which attempted to eliminate farm payments. In the following years, Congress was then forced to appropriate \$33.5 billion dollars to farm support programs, in form of "emergency" payments that are not accounted for in the budget. Freedom to Farm failed, as I and others who opposed the bill believed it would. Today, we can correct that error.

Why do America's agricultural communities and economy need federal assistance to remain healthy? At this time, there are two very important reasons. First is the reality of heavy agricultural subsidization around the world, including by the trading partners who criticize our policies. Editorials and rhetoric notwithstanding, the fact remains that America's agricultural producers are the most technologically advanced and efficient in the world and have the benefit of some of the most productive agricultural land in the world. In a global agricultural economy truly free of subsidization, America's farmers would not need subsidies to remain profitable. However, from developed nations to emerging economies, agricultural production across the world is incredible subsidized, resulting in a vicious cycle of increasing subsidies and falling prices that cascades around the globe.

For example, the EU's Common Agricultural Policy, CAP, is notorious for its subsidization levels, which are generally much higher than

America's. According to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, OECD, the EU spent \$21 billion more than the U.S. on farm support, including emergency payments, in 1999. Frankly, for our European friends to then issue press releases decrying H.R. 2646 is hypocritical. The solution to the vicious cycle of global agricultural subsidies is cooperative international negotiations, not unilateral action by the U.S. Congress to drastically reduce our subsidies, which would not likely be followed by our friends around the world.

Exports are the second economic arena where American farmers are hit extremely hard by global financial conditions far beyond their control. The strength of the dollar relative to other currencies, a result of our international standing, resilient economy, and political stability, makes imports from other countries—especially those with weak currencies—relatively cheaper and our exports of all kinds relatively more expensive. The increasing instability of Asian and Latin American nations in the last five years has greatly exacerbated this situation, leading the dollar to perceptions of risk by investors around the world.

With the levels of efficiency and productivity inherent in American agriculture, American farmers should be exporting more commodities and livestock, but they are prevented by the global financial equivalent of a flood. A strong dollar is a good thing, but a deluge of global dollar demand can be very damaging to our exporters. Currently 25 percent of Texas agriculture is exported, much of it shipped through the Port of Houston in my district.

Although I represent an urban and suburban district, I am acutely aware that agriculture is the second largest sector of the Texas economy, ranking only behind energy and petrochemicals. Further shocks to Texas agriculture will reverberate around the state and limit Texas' potential for future growth. As I mentioned earlier, agricultural exports are important for the Port of Houston, where they rank second to energy and petrochemicals in terms of export value and tonnage. America's agricultural economy is not isolated from the larger economy, and I would urge other urban and suburban members to look into how businesses in their own districts and regions would be adversely affected by a crash in the farm economy—which might well happen if the Farm Security Act fails to be enacted soon. Already agricultural banks and lenders are reluctant to continue their relationships with hundreds of thousands of American farmers without a clear statement of farm policy from Congress.

In short, I support the conference report on H.R. 2646 because it represents a return to truth in budgeting and will maintain the viability of Texas farmers in a global economic environment characterized by heavy agricultural subsidies around the world and an extremely unfavorable export environment.

In closing, I would like to also mention two of the most controversial issues in the 2002 Farm Bill debate: conservation and payment limitations. Contrary to the rhetoric by opponents of farm support, significant changes for the better have been made in both of these areas. First, conservation spending in the conference report is increased by 96 percent over current levels. The final level of \$17.1 billion over 10 years represents a \$1.3 billion increase over the House-approved level and a

significant movement by the House conferees who had provided an 80 percent increase in their version of the Farm Bill. Second, the maximum payment allowed by the conference report is \$190,000 less than the maximum allowed in the House version and \$100,000 less than current law. Currently a small number large producers have been able to obtain over-sized payments beyond their necessity, and I believe great progress is being made to remedy that situation in this conference report.

For those who recognize the great importance of the agricultural economy and support increasing conservation programs like the Conservation Reserve Program and Wetlands Reserve Program, the conference report represents a win-win situation. For those who want to support farmers faced with higher levels of subsidization abroad and monetary trade barriers without allowing certain individuals to game the system, this conference report represents a win-win situation. Unfortunately, those who do not recognize the importance of the agricultural economy will probably never fail to find fault with federal farm policy, even though their ultimate goal—a complete phase-out—was tried in 1996 and miserably failed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the conference report on H.R. 2646, the Farm Security Act, and send this bill to the Senate and to the President's desk.

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this farm bill. This is a good bill that meets the needs of America's farmers and the American consumer. It certainly does not solve all the problems we have in agriculture, but it sure does take a big step forward. A vote for this farm bill is a vote for an affordable food policy. American families can continue to enjoy the fact that their food is the most affordable, safe, and abundant in the world.

I am particularly pleased with the new counter-cyclical program. Over the last five years, we've seen record lows for farm outputs and record highs for farm inputs. The counter-cyclical program will help farmers bridge these problems and help secure high quality, low cost food for our nation.

I also am pleased with the new emphasis that this legislation places on value-added agriculture. More than anything else we can do, giving greater incentives to family farmers to add value to their commodities will create new opportunities to survive and remain profitable. Producing ethanol, preserving the identity of commodities for niche markets, expanding biodiesel production, and a whole range of new and exciting farming ventures will reinvigorate the farming community and create new employment opportunities on the farm and in the agricultural industry as a whole.

In closing, let me thank Chairman COMBEST, the committee's ranking member Mr. STENHOLM and all the conferees for their good work. I urge my colleagues to reject the motion to recommit and adopt the farm bill conference report.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support to the Farm Bill Conference Report.

We owe Representatives STENHOLM, CLAYTON, and Chairman COMBEST a great deal for their leadership.

This bill provides \$6.4 billion in nutrition programs.

Restores food stamp benefits for legal permanent residents, children, and the disabled.

Includes provisions to simplify and streamline the Food Stamp Program so needy families can get food with less red tape.

As opposed to what some have claimed, this bill is good for California.

California is the largest agricultural State, but we mostly produce fruits and vegetables, otherwise known as specialty crops.

The conference report provides for the largest investment in conservation ever—\$17.1 billion—fully 80 percent above the levels of the Boehlert conservation amendment to the 1996 Farm Bill.

Let us also remember that farmers are workers too—equally deserving of good wages and benefits.

They are the soul of our Nation. They feed us. They keep our Nation alive.

Support farmers, the working poor, and our dairy and cattle—support the conference report on the farm bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this Conference Report on the long-awaited Farm Bill legislation. As a member of the House Agriculture Committee, I want to thank my colleagues and those in the other body for their tireless work to produce this much-needed reauthorization of agriculture programs.

I am especially proud of the successful effort to create a National Dairy Program to benefit producers across the country. I strongly support providing much needed assistance to dairy farmers, and I am pleased that farmers in all states will have a safety net to protect their operations when prices are low, as they are right now. Dating back to December of last year, the Dairy Program would have provided approximately \$3 million in payments to farmers in my home state of Maine through the month of May. Since milk prices are expected to remain low, this Dairy Program will help stem the tide of small family farmers forced to sell their operations, just as the Dairy Compact once did.

Furthermore, I would like to thank my colleagues for their support in extending the Senior Farmers Markets Program. This is a critical program that benefits farmers and low-income seniors alike. Through State coupon programs, farmers' markets will have a steady base of customers, and America's elderly will have a reliable source of locally grown fresh fruits and vegetables. It's a win-win situation, and I am pleased that this Farm Bill will continue to fund these local efforts.

Finally, I would like to comment on the historic boost in conservation spending contained in this bill. My district in Maine will benefit greatly from the generous increases in the Environmental Quality Incentives Program, Farmland Protection Program, and Forest Land Enhancement Program, to name a few. In a state that grows few program crops, the emphasis on conservation program in the Farm Bill will help my farmers to adopt good stewardship practices on their lands and protect wildlife habitats and local watersheds.

Again, I want to thank the Conferees and all my colleagues on the Agriculture Committee for their hard work in seeing this Farm Bill through to completion. I look forward to the Senate's ratification of the Conference Report and the President's signature on the bill. The programs and assistance outlined in this legislation will help to secure the farmers of America and ensure the health and growth of our nation's food supplies.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support for the Farm Security Act of 2002 conference report. I want to commend Chairman COMBEST and all of the conferees for their diligence and efforts on behalf of our Nation's farmers.

This conference report is an example of what can be accomplished when Congress decides to work towards a compromise to benefit all parties involved. Not only will his conference report provide crop supports through fixed and countercyclical payments, loan rates and target prices; but it will also create yield updates available to producers across the country; and a strong farm safety net.

In addition, the conference report before us today will provide the large increase in farm bill history for voluntary conservation measures taken by farmers and landowners. In fact, an 80 percent increase in budget support over current levels will be allocated for important environmental and conservation programs.

More importantly, this conference report will provide needed assistance to our onion farmers in Orange County, NY. These farmers have experienced over 5 years of devastation crop and market losses, due to rain, flood, hail, high winds and drought. The assistance to be provided in this conference report will allow family farmers the opportunity to continue to farm. I thank Speaker HASTERT and Chairman COMBEST for their efforts on behalf of our hard working Orange County farmers.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this farmer and conservation friendly farm bill.

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in qualified support of the conference report to H.R. 2646, The Farm Security and Rural Investment Act.

While California is the top agricultural state economy in the United States, the bulk of this legislation's spending—\$47.8 out of \$73.5 billion—benefits only 9 percent of California's agriculture value. Again, it will be those midwest states that only produce 20 percent of the total value of U.S. agriculture that benefit most from federal farm legislation.

The National Dairy Program is another unfortunate aspect of the bill which threatens California's thriving dairy economy. While our dairy herds continue to increase in size, production and efficiency, we will be drawn into a national program designed to address region-specific problems in other parts of the country, specifically the Northeast. There is simply no reason to meddle in a healthy national market to the benefit of only a few. \$2 billion, which would have been better spent on research or nutrition, will be distributed to regions that contribute the least to our national economy.

It was with great diligence and constant effort that gains were accomplished for the State of California. Specialty crop producers received more assistance in this bill than any other farm legislation passed by Congress to date.

Specialty crops have been especially successful at accessing foreign markets. This bill supports these international efforts by providing technical assistance to combat trade barriers, as well as increasing funding for the Market Access Program. Country of origin labeling will be mandatory for fruits, vegetables, fish, meat and peanuts in two years. This is a consumer-right-to-know issue that brings us to parity with labeling practices of other countries.

While California growers are as burdened as other producers in this country by environmental regulations, traditional farm conservation programs have historically been unresponsive to unique specialty crop conservation issues and practices. Increased funding for EQUIP and the Farmland Protection Program; a Water Conservation Program to address ground water and irrigation issues; and the Conservation Security Program all provide more conservation benefits to California than ever before. Of particular interest to Central Valley farmers, this bill requires a study on providing insurance to farmers suffering losses due to regulatory droughts caused by government failure to deliver on CVPIA contracts.

Our attempts to heighten awareness of the unique needs of specialty crops, and to craft legislation that is responsive to the needs of specialty crop producers, will continue. Progress should be marked by commodity spending that is proportional to those products' market share, productivity and efficiency. We should focus on achieving benefits in farm policy that accrue to as many taxpayers as possible.

Although this farm bill makes strides towards helping California farmers, many challenges beyond the farm bill remain if agriculture is to remain viable in California. Specifically, water issues, regulatory reform, and fair treatment of Central Valley agriculture interests will continue to be the key battles for California agriculture.

All the farm-friendly agricultural policy has been, and will continue to be undercut if we do not have a sufficient and reliable water supply. Agricultural leaders must take every opportunity to place this goal at the centerpiece of not just our agricultural policy, but of our water policy, our budgetary policy, our infrastructure policy, our economic development policy and our environmental policy. For example, progress on CALFED must be predicated on progress on increased water storage opportunities. Inclusion of environmental restoration projects in state and federal budgets and in state water bonds must be conditioned upon funding for water storage projects. Infrastructure improvements in California must include improvements to our water delivery systems, including increased water storage.

Since being elected to the Congress, I have pursued every opportunity for regulatory reform—bringing common-sense into our regulatory process. Examples abound of senseless waste of our government resources, our natural resources, and of tremendous economic impact to business in the name of environmental protection. Our government regulators owe it to the public to avoid these consequences, where possible. Even so, economic impacts will be felt where sound scientific principles have shown a need. Unfortunately, and all too often, environmental protection regulations have produced obscured consequences in order to provide minimal, and at times, unproven benefit to the environment. In some instances, we've had to rein in federal agencies with budget control language or with demanding a change in policy. We've even had to rein in the Congress by passing the Unfunded Mandates Reform bill, which requires the Congress to assess the impact of proposed legislation on state and local governments. The fight is far from over. Legislation, which I have introduced, the Private Sector Mandate Information Act, would require Con-

gress to consider the impact to private business of its proposed laws. Passage of this legislation, which requires federal agencies to engage in a "risk assessment/cost benefit analysis" of their proposed regulations, is also essential.

We must demand equity and fair treatment of Central Valley and agricultural interests. Unfortunately, examples abound of the agricultural industry and of our region being treated unfairly. For example, I voted against NAFTA and other trade agreements because our U.S. negotiators traded away our agricultural interests in an effort to save our "favored" industries, such as high-tech. This is not "free" trade, but "unfair" trade. Our air pollution and water pollution laws are illustrative of the unfair treatment that our region receives. Bay Area interests pressured state and federal agencies to challenge our use of irrigation water and agricultural pesticides and have challenged our dairy production practices. These same Bay Area interests have gotten state and federal agencies to look the other way when Bay Area refineries discharge pollutants into the SF Bay. Also, Bay Area legislators successfully obtained an exemption from the SMOG II program, while at the same time, forcing the program in our area.

Elected officials from this region must demand fairness to the Central Valley and to agriculture. From budgetary fairness, fairness in our regulatory laws and regulations, and in trade agreements, we must be vigilant in this cause.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on the farm bill. The conference report's provisions on sugar will impose an undue burden on the working people in my congressional district.

The conference report fails to reform the sugar price support program so as to accommodate the interests of consumers and workers in the Chicago area. Of even greater concern, it takes a bad sugar program and makes it even worse by repealing the sugar forfeiture penalty and imposing marketing allotments.

Employment in the Chicago confectionery industry has fallen 11 percent since 1991. The sugar program has contributed to this decline. Sugar price supports and import quotas keep the cost of U.S. sugar at least twice as high as the world price. Besides raising consumer prices, increasing taxpayer costs and threatening the environment, the price gap creates an artificial incentive to move domestic food and confection manufacturing operations offshore. And this has happened in my own back yard in Chicago with the announcement of plant shutdowns by candy makers.

By repealing the forfeiture penalty, the conference report will effectively increase price supports.

By imposing a complicated system of production controls, the conference report will further disrupt the marketing of sugar and raise sugar prices for consumers.

Mr. Speaker, the people hurt by the conference report provisions on sugar will be ordinary taxpayers, consumers and workers who do not get subsidies or protection like wealthy sugar producing companies do. That is not right. And so I must oppose the conference report.

Mr. OSE. Mr. Speaker, I am troubled by various provisions in the Farm Security Act of 2002 (H.R. 2646). Today, I would like to mention one specific provision, which appears in

four titles in the bill—in Titles I, Commodity Programs (Sec. 1601); Title II, Conservation (Sec. 2702); Title VI, Rural Development (Sec. 6103); and Title X, Miscellaneous (Sec. 10105). As Chairman of the Government Reform Subcommittee on Energy Policy, Natural Resources and Regulatory Affairs, I have responsibility for oversight over regulatory reform and paperwork reduction measures. This includes compliance with the due process notice and comment provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) and the centralized review and approval provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA).

H.R. 2646 exempts certain Agriculture regulations both from the APA's due process protections for affected parties and the PRA's required review and approval by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Under the PRA, OMB is charged with assuring practical utility to all information collections imposed on the public. Also, the PRA includes a public protection clause, which assures that the public cannot be penalized for not providing information in unauthorized paperwork.

The Department of Agriculture has one of the worst track records in terms of compliance with the PRA. In fact, Agriculture has had the most or second most number of violations of the PRA in each of the last several years—116 in Fiscal Year (FY) 1999, 96 in FY 2000, and 67 in FY 2001. On April 11, 2002, an Agriculture witness at our Subcommittee's annual hearing on the PRA was unable to answer our questions about its mis-management of the paperwork it imposes on the public. Agriculture promised explanations by the next day; however, I have received nothing to date. In addition, last May, I wrote OMB Director Daniels and Interior Secretary Norton asking them to work with Agriculture to eliminate duplication of reporting, especially for farmers. Sadly, there are no results to date.

The Joint Explanatory Statement of the Committee on Conference includes no justification for this significant change in regulatory and paperwork promulgation procedures. This is unacceptable.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the conference report to H.R. 2646, the Farm Security and Rural Improvement Act of 2002.

I believe this compromise contains the best possible commodity title for Southern agriculture.

Reforming the farm bill effective for this year has been a top priority for Georgia producers. Since passage of the 1996 farm bill, my producers have fully utilized planting flexibility, and the result has been a major shift in acreage from feed grains and oilseeds to cotton. Because producers wanted farm program benefits to more accurately reflect their most recent plantings, it was imperative that they have the option to update their bases. As this was a popular provision in the House bill, the Senate included it in their bill, and the conference report contains the measure.

For the first time in my Congressional career, peanut producers, shellers, and manufacturers joined together in proposing a peanut program dramatically different from the decades-old quota program. Due to their unity, trade concerns, and political realities, the House Agriculture Committee took the proposal under serious consideration. The conference report retains these reforms by putting the peanut program on par with traditional

commodity programs and fairly compensates holders of quota for their losses under the new program, which will infuse over \$500 million into the State of Georgia.

Of particular concern to Southern producers was the strict, burdensome payment limitations contained in the Senate bill. The Senate bill failed to take into consideration regional differences in farm size and structure, and would have yielded many unintended consequences. In anticipation of the Senate provision, producers in Georgia this year prepared land to substitute other crops, such as corn and soybeans, for cotton. The net effect, had the Senate provision been adopted, would have been a wreck of Midwestern crop markets. We did compromise with the Senate in the conference report on payment limitations, but not to the extent that would compromise agriculture in this country.

This farm bill not only brings predictability to federal farm policy but also greatly expands and improves our soil and water conservation programs. The federal investment in these programs is increased by more than 80% above current program levels and costs \$2 billion over the House-passed bill, adding \$17.1 billion into conservation programs over the next 10 years. The bill makes needed changes to the CRP and EQIP programs to make them more usable and accessible to all producers in all regions of the country.

As the title suggests, The Farm Security and Rural Investment Act makes significant investments in, and improvements to our rural development programs. These programs are important to sustaining rural communities by investing in programs that will aid in the development of rural infrastructure and create jobs in rural areas. The trade title of the conference report is designed to comport with the United States' international trade obligations under the WTO, and thereby to promote more free and fair trade for the future. It reauthorizes important programs related to trade, including the Food for Progress and Food for Peace Programs.

The conference report illustrates to the research community that Congress recognizes the critical need for research and makes a significant new investment in research programs that will help reap rewards for producers and society for many years to come.

The forestry title strengthens the commitment of Congress to sustainable forest management practices. In addition to assisting states in carrying out programs of forestry research, the forestry title provides enhanced community fire protection by directing the Administration to coordinate with local communities in implementing rural fire protection and control strategies. It also enables the Administration to undertake a variety of activities aimed at preventing fires on both federal and non-federal lands.

For the first time, the farm bill contains an energy title to further our investment in energy research and encourage the production of biodiesel and fuel grade ethanol.

This conference report seeks to ensure access to an adequate diet and the fruits of a productive agricultural economy to all eligible Americans. This farm bill includes a number of changes to simplify the food stamp program, gives greater flexibility, remove unnecessary barriers to participation, and increase assistance to working families.

The Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 provides for the very basic ele-

ments of life that we take for granted: food on the table provided by our nation's farmers, food stamps for those who cannot afford nourishment, grants to communities to provide safe and adequate quantities of drinking water, grants to help rural residents access their local television stations, and grants to provide training to rural firefighters and emergency personnel.

Serving as a conferee on this bill over the past 10 weeks has not been an easy task, but I am pleased to see the conference come to a close. I can say with clear conscience that every aspect of this bill was thoroughly debated. As with any bill the Congress submits to the President, it's not perfect, but it is the best possible bill that could be reported out of conference. We have fought the good fight and have a balanced bill—regionally and substantively—that will contribute to the betterment of agriculture.

I thank LARRY COMBEST and CHARLIE STENHOLM for their diligence in guiding the Committee in the spirit of bipartisanship and for providing the necessary leadership over the past 2 years in getting this bill done.

To my farmers back home, you can stop watching and waiting on Washington—get in the fields and plant.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Farm Security Act conference report (H.R. 2646). I appreciate the work of the Agriculture Committee to bring a bill to the floor, but this effort falls short of real reform for our farm programs and seriously infringes on our trade policy.

I supported the Freedom to Farm Act in 1995. It set us on a path—slow but steady—toward removing the heavy and costly hand of government in managing crop programs. Subsidies were to become a thing of the past. Unfortunately, this bill reverses that course. It sets us on a path toward increased and never-ending taxpayer subsidies of basic commodities.

In addition, this legislation is incompatible with our commitments to the World Trade Organization, and I am not alone in this opinion. Let me read some excerpts from a Congressional Research Service report that was issued just a few days ago:

The 1994 Uruguay Round Agreement on Agriculture commits member countries of the World Trade Organization (WTO) to discipline their domestic agricultural support programs . . . The goal of the Agreement is to "establish a fair and market-oriented agricultural trading system" through a series of reforms that also require WTO members to lower barriers to agricultural imports and to reduce their farm export subsidies. The [Uruguay Round Agreement on Agriculture] was unprecedented in that it was the first time (after seven previous trade rounds) that countries promised to make substantial changes in their domestic agricultural policies to facilitate more open trade.

The report further states:

WTO members bring to the new negotiating round a divergence of viewpoints on how to handle domestic farm supports. These range from countries that will seek continuing and deeper reductions in farm subsidies, to those that are likely to defend their internal subsidies as necessary for various national policy reasons. Meanwhile, Congress is now widely expected to adopt a new farm bill that would provide billions of dollars in new farm subsidies annually (i.e., above current service policy projections).

These new subsidies, and their potential to perpetuate market distortions, undermine the U.S. argument in the Doha round that the world's agricultural subsidies should be further disciplined, critics argue. A number of foreign officials, and some U.S. analysts, have pointedly noted that the likely new U.S. farm policy raises questions about the sincerity of the U.S. negotiating position.

We should not be undermining our negotiating efforts at the WTO, and this conference report will unfortunately do just that.

Further, I am extremely disappointed that this final agreement requires mandatory country of origin labeling for meat, fruits, vegetables, fish, and peanuts. In order to meet the threshold of being labeled a "USA product," it must be born, raised and processed in the United States.

This is ridiculous. I grew up on a ranch in southern Arizona, and my family bought calves in Mexico to be raised and sold on our ranch. So I guess if I bought a small calf in Mexico and raised him for 5 years on my ranch in the United States, he would still never be a "U.S. calf." Even immigrants coming to the United States are allowed to obtain U.S. citizenship after 5 years, but no such luck for a calf. He would be treated like a future U.S. President under the Constitution. If you're not born here, you can't become President. And if a calf is born in Mexico—even if his mother is a "U.S. cow" that went through a cut border fence to have her calf in Mexico and returned a few days later—this calf will never be able to be labeled as a "USA product."

Is this what our national policy should be? I find this outrageous and am surprised that something like this is on the road to becoming law.

It was my hope that we would be able to fashion a new farm policy that helps the farmers, increases conservation efforts, reduces the price of food for the American people, and fulfills our obligations to our trading partners around the world.

Unfortunately, the conference report before us today does not accomplish these goals.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, due to the death of my stepmother last night, I will miss the vote on the farm bill, as I am traveling to Fort Worth, TX, to be with my father and other family.

Had I been able to cast my vote on this bill, I would have voted "no."

The genuine problems of America's farmers and rural communities will never be fixed by these enormously-expensive subsidies. The biggest costs have nothing to do with helping family farmers. Although the House and Senate each voted that nobody should receive more than \$275,000 per year in subsidies, the final bill says there's no limit on the amount! That typifies the problems with this bill.

American farmers, consumers and taxpayers need more free enterprise, not more big-government subsidies. I'll keep voting to help farmers by expanding world markets, diversifying agriculture, encouraging rural economic development and providing fairer tax treatment to farmers.

We have enormous expenses for the war on terrorism and for homeland security, and we've got to provide whatever it takes to protect America. But that's no excuse for huge escalation in other spending. We're undermining our future if we don't get better control over spending taxpayer's money. Unless we adopt the Balanced Budget Amendment to the

Constitution, requiring a balanced budget in peacetime, we may never get spending back under control.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. KIND

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. KIND. In its present form I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KIND of Wisconsin moves to recommit the conference report on the bill, H.R. 2646, to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to—

(1) agree to the provisions in section 169(a) of the Senate amendment relating to payment limitations for commodity programs; and

(2) increase—

(A) the amounts within the scope of conference provided in title II of the conference report for conservation programs by an amount equal to 50 percent of any reduction in Federal spending resulting from agreement to the provisions referred to in paragraph (1);

(B) the amounts within the scope of conference provided in title IV of the conference report for nutrition programs by an amount equal to 15 percent of any such reduction;

(C) the amounts within the scope of conference provided in title VI of the conference report for rural development programs by an amount equal to 25 percent of any such reduction; and

(D) the amounts within the scope of conference provided in title IX of the conference report for energy programs by an amount equal to 10 percent of any such reduction.

Mr. KIND (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to recommit be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully object, because this is the first time a lot of Members have seen this. There is no debate on this. Consequently, as short as it is, I think it should be read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the conference report.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 172, noes 251, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 122]

AYES—172

Ackerman	Hoefel	Nussle
Allen	Hoekstra	Obey
Andrews	Holt	Olver
Baldacci	Honda	Owens
Baldwin	Hostettler	Pallone
Barrett	Houghton	Pascarella
Bass	Hoyer	Pastor
Becerra	Inslee	Payne
Bereuter	Israel	Pelosi
Berkley	Jackson (IL)	Petri
Berman	Johnson (CT)	Pitts
Biggart	Kanjorski	Rahall
Bilirakis	Kaptur	Ramstad
Blumenauer	Kelly	Rivers
Bonior	Kennedy (RI)	Roemer
Borski	Kerns	Rothman
Boucher	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Brady (PA)	Kilpatrick	Royce
Brown (OH)	Kind (WI)	Sanchez
Capito	Kleczka	Sawyer
Capps	Kucinich	Schakowsky
Capuano	LaFalce	Schiff
Cardin	Langevin	Sensenbrenner
Castle	Lantos	Serrano
Chabot	Larson (CT)	Shaw
Collins	Latham	Shays
Cox	Leach	Sherman
Coyne	Lee	Slaughter
Crowley	Levin	Smith (MI)
Davis (CA)	Lewis (GA)	Smith (WA)
Davis (FL)	LoBiondo	Solis
Davis (IL)	Lofgren	Stark
Davis, Tom	Lowey	Stearns
DeFazio	Luther	Strickland
DeGette	Lynch	Stupak
Delahunt	Maloney (CT)	Sununu
DeMint	Maloney (NY)	Tancredo
Deutsch	Markey	Tauscher
Dicks	Matheson	Thune
Dingell	Matsui	Tiberi
Doggett	McCarthy (MO)	Tierney
Doyle	McCollum	Toomey
Ehlers	McGovern	Udall (CO)
Engel	McInnis	Udall (NM)
Eshoo	McKinney	Upton
Farr	McNulty	Velazquez
Filner	Meehan	Waters
Flake	Meeks (NY)	Watson (CA)
Frank	Menendez	Waxman
Gallegly	Miller, Dan	Weiner
Ganske	Miller, George	Weldon (FL)
Goss	Mollohan	Wexler
Green (TX)	Moore	Wolf
Greenwood	Moran (VA)	Woolsey
Harman	Morella	Wu
Hefley	Myrick	Young (FL)
Hinchey	Nadler	
Hobson	Neal	

NOES—251

Abercrombie	Boswell	Conyers
Aderholt	Boyd	Cooksey
Akin	Brady (TX)	Costello
Armey	Brown (FL)	Cramer
Baca	Brown (SC)	Crenshaw
Bachus	Bryant	Cubin
Baird	Burr	Culberson
Baker	Burton	Cummings
Ballenger	Buyer	Cunningham
Barcia	Callahan	Davis, Jo Ann
Barr	Calvert	Deal
Bartlett	Camp	DeLauro
Barton	Cantor	DeLay
Bentsen	Carson (IN)	Diaz-Balart
Berry	Carson (OK)	Dooley
Bishop	Chambliss	Doolittle
Blagojevich	Clay	Dreier
Blunt	Clayton	Duncan
Boehlert	Clement	Dunn
Boehner	Clyburn	Edwards
Bonilla	Coble	Ehrlich
Bono	Combest	Emerson
Boozman	Condit	English

Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ferguson
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Grucci
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Keller
Kennedy (MN)
King (NY)

NOT VOTING—11

Cannon
Crane
Fattah
Istook

□ 1303

Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. BONO, and Messrs. BAIRD, ARMEY, PICKERING, SAXTON, and LINDER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Ms. SOLIS, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, and Messrs. GALLEGLY, HOBSON, MCINNIS, and DICKS changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY). The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 280, nays 141, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 123]

YEAS—280

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Bartlett
Barton
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blunt
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bono
Boozman
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Combest
Condit
Cooksey
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal
DeLauro
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Ford
Frost
Gekas
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutierrez

Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)

Woolsey
Wu

Wynn
Young (AK)

NAYS—141

Ackerman
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baldwin
Barr
Barrett
Bass
Becerra
Berman
Biggart
Bilirakis
Blumenauer
Boehner
Bonior
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Collins
Conyers
Cox
Coyne
Crowley
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLay
Deutsch
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Eshoo

NOT VOTING—13

Burton
Cannon
Crane
Fattah
Istook

□ 1311

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on May 2, 2002, due to a family commitment, I was unavailable for rollcall vote No. 123. Had I been here, I would have vote “yea.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, due to official business concerning water quality issues in my Congressional district, I missed rollcall votes 122 and 123. Had I been present I would have voted “nay” on rollcall 122 the motion to recommit and “yea” on rollcall 123 final passage.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Mollohan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4. An act to enhance energy conservation, research and development and to provide for security and diversity in the energy supply for the American people, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 4) "An Act to enhance energy conservation, research and development and to provide for security and diversity in the energy supply for the American people, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. KERRY, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. REID, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. LOTT, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. CAMPBELL, and Mr. THOMAS, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1646. An act to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal years 2002 and 2003, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 1646) entitled "An Act to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal years 2002 and 2003, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BIDEN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DODD, Mr. KERRY, Mr. HELMS, Mr. LUGAR, and Mr. HAGEL, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3295. An act to establish a program to provide funds to States to replace punch card voting systems, to establish the Election Assistance Commission to assist in the administration of Federal elections and to otherwise provide assistance with the administration of certain Federal election laws and programs, to establish minimum election administration standards for States and units of local government with responsibility for the administration of Federal elections, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 3295) "An Act to establish a program to provide funds to States to replace punch card voting systems, to establish the Election Assistance Commission to assist in the administration of Federal elections and to otherwise provide assistance with the administration of certain Federal election laws and programs, to establish minimum election administration standards for States and units of local government with responsibility for the administration of Federal elections, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses

thereon, and appoints Mr. DODD, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, and Mr. BOND, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 103. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Better Hearing and Speech Month, and for other purposes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany H.R. 2646 just adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 404 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 404

Resolved, That it shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of Thursday, May 2, 2002, for the Speaker to entertain a motion that the House suspend the rules relating to the resolution (H. Res. 392) expressing solidarity with Israel in its fight against terrorism. If the Speaker entertains such motion, debate under clause 1(c) of rule XV shall be extended to one hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

(Mr. DIAZ-BALART asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 404 is a rule providing for the consideration of House Resolution 392 at any time on the legislative day of today, Thursday, May 2, under suspension of the rules.

The rule further provides 1 hour of debate on the suspension measure, rather than the customary 40 minutes. This is a fair rule that would allow consideration, Mr. Speaker, of an important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I am a proud cosponsor of the resolution before us today. It expresses strong solidarity by this Congress of the state of Israel. Israel continues to be victimized by acts of ter-

ror. This resolution reaffirms the Congress' belief that Israel has a right to self-defense in the face of cowardly attacks against innocent civilians.

The United States has been a proud friend of Israel since President Truman promptly recognized the Jewish state in 1948. If there is one issue that unites us in this Congress, Republicans and Democrats, conservatives and liberals, it is and it should be our support for Israel.

□ 1315

As the resolution states, since September on a basis proportional to the United States population, approximately 9,000 Israelis have been assassinated by homicide bombers, three times the number of innocent civilians killed in the terrorist attacks of New York and Washington on September 11.

Israel has been under attack in recent months, ferociously and viciously attacked. Friends can best show their friendship when friends are precisely under attack. Our friend, Israel, is today under attack and so today once again we reiterate our friendship with Israel.

I would like to lend my supporting commendation to the efforts of President Bush and Secretary Powell and all of those involved in the difficult search for peace. I also would like to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) and all of my fellow co-sponsors of this resolution for introducing and for pressing for its passage at this time.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules this afternoon brings to the floor a rule such as this to allow the House to consider very timely measures. I urge all of my colleagues to support this very straightforward rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this rule permits the House to consider today under suspension of the rules 1 hour of debate on H. Res. 392, expressing solidarity with Israel in its fight against terrorism.

I urge the House to approve this rule so we can immediately demonstrate our strong support for the State of Israel, bypassing the underlying resolution.

Mr. Speaker, we face a historic turning point in the Middle East. All of us, Democrats and Republicans, want peace in the region and all of us want a strong vital State of Israel to prosper. In order for that to happen, the United States must reaffirm its longstanding support for Israel as we attempt to achieve a peaceful solution to the problems of the region. There should be no misunderstanding in the rest of the world: we are Israel's friend as she deals with the wave of terrorism directed against her by her enemies. That does not mean that we cannot

make constructive suggestions to our ally and work for a solution that provides two states in the region, one Israeli and one Palestinian.

But key to all of this is the clear understanding that Israel is our ally. She is the only democracy in the region and has always been our friend. And now in her time of need Israel stands virtually alone. Much of Europe has turned its back on Israel and few in the Arab world are willing to stand up to the radical elements that conduct terrorism against innocent civilians, including women and children.

The resolution that we will vote on later today is somewhat different from the original one drafted by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the ranking Democrat on the Committee on International Relations. Some of us might reword portions of the resolution if we had that option. But we would not change the basic thrust of the resolution, that America stand by its ally at this critical juncture. The procedure chosen by the majority does not give us the opportunity to change one word in the resolution. It is unamendable and subject to a straight up-or-down vote. That being the case, it is my hope that the resolution will receive an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote at the end of the day.

Americans must speak with an unequivocal voice at this juncture in history. We stand with Israel in its fight against terrorism, and we urge the Palestinians to reject the extremists in their midst and to work for peace. We must also reject the pessimists who say that there is no solution for the differences that divide Israel and Palestinians. The United States is the only nation in the world that can mediate this dispute. It is my hope that the Bush administration will continue to be engaged at the highest level in seeking a peaceful solution.

But make no mistake about our role. We are not a neutral bystander with no stake in the outcome. We stand for a strong vital Israel and should continue to play a constructive role to ensure both peace and Israel's future.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER), my good friend and colleague from the Committee on Rules.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support the rule on H. Res. 392, a bill expressing the United States' solidarity with Israel in its ongoing fight against terrorism.

H. Res. 392 supports Israel's efforts to dismantle the terrorist infrastructure in Palestinian areas and reiterates the United States' commitment to Israel as an ally by reproaching acts of terror condoned by Arafat and other Palestinian leadership. It also demands that Palestinian leadership adhere to dismantling terrorist groups. Finally, the bill challenges Israel's Middle Eastern

neighbors to set a good example to the Palestinians by pursuing a policy of peaceful relations with Israel.

Mr. Speaker, I have been to Israel on three occasions; and each time I went, the vulnerability and terror were more and more palpable. These are people living in terror on a daily basis. We have responded to terror in our midst in a ferocious way. We should expect Israel to do the same. We simply cannot ask our citizens to continue to live under terror.

Approving this rule that brings H. Res. 392 to the floor is a good step we can take as a Nation and we can take it today to help heal Israeli-Palestinian relations. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting both the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the resolution. This resolution expresses the solidarity of the Congress and the American people with Israel in a struggle against the forces of hatred and violence. It is both fitting and appropriate for us today to declare our support at a time when Israel had been subjected to repeated acts of terror.

Israel is our most reliable friend in the Middle East. It is our only democracy, a beacon of hope in the region of the world for the freedom we all take for granted. Freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of religion, freedom to challenge your government nonviolently without fear of retribution simply do not exist. Israel is the only country in the Middle East that guarantees all of these freedoms.

The Congress stands here today to condemn and reject this path of violence led by Chairman Arafat. Instead, we must return to the path of peace. Israel must have a partner who is willing to say no to those who will use terror and violence.

Chairman Arafat must take action against those Palestinians who would block the path to peace.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FERGUSON).

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and certainly as a strong supporter and core sponsor of the underlying legislation. I am also proud today to stand with my colleagues to express our solidarity with the people of Israel and our steadfast support in their fight against terrorism.

The people of Israel have become a target of a sustained campaign of violence that does not discriminate between soldier and citizen, and will yet target the innocent. The victims of this violence are citizens who put themselves in danger merely by going to work or conducting their daily routine. They are indiscriminately struck

down as they go to the market, eat at a cafe, or simply walk down the street. This barbarism cannot and will not be tolerated. And as a country that loves freedom, we can only be supportive of our friends in Israel during their time of need.

Our partnership began with Israel at its very birth as a nation in 1948, and it remains strong today. Israel is the sole democracy in the Middle East; and, therefore, the United States and Israel share a common bond. Our connection is strong and deeply rooted in our citizens' love for freedom. The connection between our two countries is now extended because of a new similarity, our common disdain for terrorism and our commitment to stop those who perpetuate it.

Mr. Speaker, last August I had an opportunity to visit Israel for my second trip; and as I left my wife was understandably nervous, concerned about violence in the Middle East. And upon my return, just a few weeks later here on our own soil, Americans, and particularly so many communities in my district in New Jersey, were devastated by the attacks of terrorism. We understand now firsthand the pain, the emotional pain, the physical pain, the economic loss and all of the problems and the heartache that come with terrorism.

It is now our opportunity to stand today to support this rule and to support our friends in Israel by standing in solidarity with them.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 1/4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, when a democracy is under siege from terrorist assault, it must defend itself. I am proud of our Nation's response to the horrors of September 11. For the last 18 months, Israel has been a democracy under siege; and it has responded in the only way that any democracy must, it has defended itself. It has not asked for this war any more than we asked for ours against al Qaeda and the Taliban. But when democracies come under terrorist attack, it is morally incumbent upon us as the world's leading democracy to express our solidarity. That is what this resolution does.

Since September 2000, terrorist suicide bombers have claimed 180 innocent Israeli lives, a number proportional to 9,000 Americans, three times the lives we lost on September 11. This past weekend on the Jewish sabbath, Palestinian terrorists murdered four Israeli civilians, including a 5-year-old child. This was not collateral damage, Mr. Speaker. This was the deliberate and premeditated murder of an innocent little girl.

Mr. Speaker, there is no difference between the pain and anguish felt by a bereft Palestinian mother or father who lost their innocent child and the heart broken Israeli mother or father who lost theirs. But as we mourn equally the innocent casualties on both sides, we dare not treat equally

those who act out of self-defense and those who act out of terrorist designs. There is no moral equivalence in this struggle.

Our bipartisan resolution, Mr. Speaker, is not neutral as some would have it. It does not equivocate. It draws a bright line between terrorist aggression, and self-defense. It clearly distinguishes between the side that made a historically generous offer of peace, and the side that spat on that offer and started a blood bath instead.

□ 1330

This resolution is not for those who seek a neutral stance in Israel's struggle against terrorism. This resolution is for those who are committed to defend democracy against terrorism and stand shoulder to shoulder with Israel in our shared struggle.

In its 54-year battle for survival, Israel has suffered numerous attacks like ours of September 11. It has never wavered in its commitment to democratic values and human rights. Now, as its very existence is again challenged, we must not waiver in our support for Israel.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote to reaffirm our strong support for our democratic ally, the state of Israel.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mr. Virginia (Mr. SCHROCK).

Mr. SCHROCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the state of Israel and this rule. We must continue to support Israel in its fight against terrorism. The citizens of Israel suffer undeserved death as suicide bombers terrorize Israeli cities almost daily. These bombers are not trying to achieve peace. They are trying to inflict mass murder throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, I have been to Israel. I have seen firsthand the fear Israelis must live with on a daily basis. Not knowing whether they or their family will survive each day is absolutely unacceptable. Israelis have the right to defend their country from these terrorist attacks.

Having visited Afghanistan during the last recess, I have witnessed the devastation decades of war produce. If we do not stand next to Israel with our full support, the most stable and successful democracy in the Middle East may well fall to ruins like the dusty towns of Afghanistan.

I will not let that happen to Israel. I support Israel, will continue to support Israel and urge my colleagues to do the same by voting yes on this resolution.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), a member of the Rules Committee.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today in support of this rule and the spirit of the underlying resolution. While we continue to consume ourselves rightly with our own war against terrorism, we cannot forget that Israel has been waging its own war against terrorism as well as its own fight for democracy for more than 54 years.

Today, I stand with my colleagues in sending a message to the people of Israel that the support Israel enjoys from the United States is stronger today than it has ever been. As we send this positive message to Israel, we must also recognize the unique role we play as moderator in the peace process.

On two occasions recently, once in February and again in March, I wrote to President Bush urging him to personally become engaged in this region's peace process, but to my disappointment, I have yet to receive a response.

Early last month I introduced a resolution condemning violence in the Middle East. I am not suggesting that my resolution is the end solution by any means. However, my resolution does something that this one does not. It recognizes that there are things that can be done by both Palestinians and Israel that will curb the ongoing violence and hopefully get the parties back to the peace table.

We need to understand that as we embark on this difficult journey we need to ask how do we educate and re-educate misinformed communities in the Middle East. We, in addition to that, need to bring to the attention of everyone the complex manifestations of ongoing violence in the Middle East, and we need to bring to this Congress' attention the increasing amounts of anti-Semitism and racism that are emerging in Europe.

This is a harsh reminder to those of us in the black and Jewish community that the fight against racism and prejudice is far from over.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today in support of this rule and the spirit of the underlying resolution. While we continue to consume ourselves with our own war against terrorism, we cannot forget that Israel has been waging its own war against terrorism, as well as its own fight for democracy, for more than 54 years.

Today, I stand with my colleagues in sending a message to the people of Israel: The support Israel enjoys from the United States is stronger today than it has ever been.

As we send this positive message to Israel, we must also recognize the unique role we play as a moderator in the peace process. With that in mind, I ask, as a cosponsor of the underlying resolution, "How does this resolution bring us closer to a comprehensive solution and ultimate peace accord?" The answer, Mr. Speaker, is that I am not certain.

Over the past five months, we have watched violence in Israel and the Palestinian territories spiral out of control. We have watched hundreds of Israelis fall victim to suicide bombings, and we have seen the deaths of more than 1,000 Palestinians. And while the numbers of deaths increased and the likelihood of a peaceful solution decreased by the

day, the Bush Administration remained largely silent.

On two occasions, once in February and the other in March, I wrote to President Bush, urging him to become personally engaged in the region. But much to my extreme disappointment, I have yet to receive a response.

There are many who claim the U.S. involvement will do little, if anything, in bringing a solution to this ongoing problem. To them I say, if we do not try, then that will become a self fulfilling prophecy. The Administration's vacillations in Middle East policy have left the U.S. in two precariously unfamiliar positions when it comes to the peace process—on the outside and unable to deliver. If we are to optimize our chances of influencing Israel and the Palestinians, then it must start from the top. The President must accept that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is his problem and, ultimately, his responsibility to help remedy.

Early last month, I introduced my own resolution condemning violence in the Middle East. I am not suggesting that my resolution is the end solution by any means. However, my resolution does something that this one does not. It recognizes that there are things that can be done by both the Palestinians and Israel that will curb the ongoing violence and hopefully get the two parties back to the negotiating table, a place that both have been absent from for some time.

Mr. Speaker, if the United States is to continue down the daunting trail of bringing peace to the Middle East, we cannot and should not forget to address a variety of other complex manifestations of the ongoing violence in the Middle East. For example, Congress must address the increasing amounts of anti-Semitism and racism that are emerging in Europe. This is a harsh reminder to those of us in the black and Jewish communities that the fight against racism and prejudice is far from over.

Furthermore, as we embark on this difficult journey, we must also ask: How do we educate and reeducate misinformed communities in the Middle East? How do we stop countries such as Syria, Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and others from teaching hate? Finally, how do we maintain the balance of cultural, religious and political differences in a region that, historically, has not desired such a balance?

In the end, Mr. Speaker, I will support the underlying resolution because I support Israel and its right to defend itself. Nevertheless, if we are to have success in bringing a real and lasting peace to the Middle East, then we must accept the realities that I have raised and hasten our resolve and engagement to assist in ending this seemingly endless conflict.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON).

(Mr. SAXTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule, and I rise in support of House Resolution 392 which expresses our solidarity with Israel in their struggle to fight terrorism and provide security for the people of Israel.

Yasser Arafat and the Palestinian leadership have simply failed to adhere

to their commitments in Oslo which would require strict adherence to a peaceful resolution to the conflicts and renounce the use of terrorism and other acts of violence. In fact, the violence has escalated, as we all know, culminating in the recent killing of 46 Israelis during the week of Passover with suicide bombings where more than 100 additional were wounded.

Yasser Arafat has demonstrated that he is not a viable peace partner, and I am glad to see that President Bush is now dealing with others. The Palestinian Authority has failed to fulfill its commitment to dismantle the terrorist infrastructure in Palestinian areas.

Due to Arafat's unwillingness or inability to act Israel's military action is understandable. Israel has an inherent right to defend herself against armed attack and to utilize preemptive measures to prevent terrorist attacks on civilian populations, as we have done ourselves in our own war against terrorism.

H.R. 392 demands that the Palestinian Authority finally fulfill its commitment to dismantle the terrorist infrastructure. It also calls on Arab States to declare their opposition to all forms of terrorism, including suicide bombings. Israel has already begun to withdraw troops from the Palestinian areas and has released Arafat from confinement. In response, all nations in the regions must denounce terrorism and work to end the violence to stabilize the region if we are to realize a lasting peace in the Middle East.

I am calling on my fellow colleagues to support H.R. 392 to send a clear message to Yasser Arafat and the Palestinian Authority.

The United States demands that Arafat call for an end to violence and assume responsibility over the actions of PLO members and prevent their future acts of terrorism.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us expresses our solidarity with Israel in its war against terrorism. We know from September 11 what it means to be attacked by a suicide or homicide bomber. We are fighting a just war 6,000 miles away in order to defend ourselves, and we should side with Israel as it fights for its very life against terrorists who are sent into Israel from operations only a few miles away.

The only way for peace is for the United States to make clear that we will demand that Israel be permitted to exist and live with peace and security.

The second way to peace is to stand up to terrorism. Palestinians killed when Israelis tried to root out terrorism in the territories, where they tried to root the infrastructure is a tragedy, but innocent civilians killed as the sole objective of murderers who are willing to kill themselves as well is abhorrent. It is vile. It should not be considered martyrdom or simply another tool to accomplish political objectives.

I know many Members would like to have various changes in this resolution, but the resolution before us ought to have the support of our colleagues, even if they would have preferred a different version, because the essence of this resolution is to stand with Israel and make clear to the Arab world, we want peace but we are not going to let them drive a wedge between the United States and Israel. They ought to forget about that.

Israel has been fighting for its very life since 1948 and has yearned for peace. It was willing to accept a Palestinian State in 1948 under the U.N. resolution. The Arabs rejected it. In 1967, the lines, the Arab world said they want to return to. They found it unacceptable in 1967 and declared a war against Israel, and Israel won that war, and has had the territory ever since, but Israel has been willing to take the risks for peace by talking about territorial changes.

It is Arafat, as the leader of the Palestinian people, who rejected the offer made at Camp David and Intaba and, rather than give a counteroffer, has gone to war. War should not be rewarded. Terrorism should not be rewarded. Only through negotiations of working out territory and security can there be peace, not a discussion of whether there ought to continue to be a state of Israel.

I urge members to vote for this resolution. Vote for it because in its very essence it puts the United States on the side of peace by assuring that there will be an Israel and that it will be secure and the terrorism will not be acceptable.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) for yielding me the time.

I rise in support of the rule and the resolution. This is a resolution that commits this Congress and the country further to go down the path for peace.

We have had a long and unique relationship with the State of Israel, but we also desire peace for all those that live in the Middle East. There is no cycle of violence in Israel any more than there is a cycle of violence as we respond to terrorists that attack the United States. There is a response to terrorism, the kind of response that is so clearly in line with the response that we had to that cowardly attack on our country.

This resolution really begins to make the case more effectively, as I think recent weeks and months have made the case, that the leader of the Palestinians today, Mr. Arafat, is not prepared to be a partner for peace. The negotiators on the Israeli government side deserve a partner for peace. Palestinians who desire peace, and the vast majority of Palestinians do desire, and deserve to be led by someone who is willing to be that partner for peace.

Mr. Arafat's been given opportunity after opportunity after opportunity. As

my friend the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) just pointed out, he was given in September of 2000 an incredible offer for a peace plan for Israel and for the Palestinian people as well. He walked away from that opportunity. He went back, it would appear from all the evidence we see, on the same path of his history in the past, a path that promotes and encourages terrorism. Certainly, not a path that seeks to end terrorism.

If, in fact, he is a viable leader, he needs to lead for peace. If he is not a viable leader, we need to seek aggressively to find someone who can be a viable leader for us to deal with, for us to be as helpful as all peoples who live in that incredibly important part of the world, seek peace in that part of the world.

This resolution sends a message to the world of where this Congress stands. I look forward to seeing it pass today. I look forward to seeing the message even more clear to Mr. Arafat and those who would encourage terrorism that we will not tolerate that on our shores, we will not tolerate that in the country of our friends, we will not tolerate that in any country anywhere, and this resolution addresses that.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

(Mrs. LOWEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand in support of H. Res. 392, expressing the solidarity of Congress with Israel in its fight against terrorism.

Fifty-four years ago after the establishment of the State, the miracle so many fought and died for is once again under attack. Indeed, the ideals and values are under siege in this difficult time in the region, freedom, democracy and human rights, are not just Israel's. They are America's as well.

Today, Israel's fundamental right to exist within secure borders is being questioned by both sworn enemies and one-time friends of the Jewish state. The United Nations Human Rights Commission, which spent most of its recent session ignoring human rights violations around the world, voted to condone Palestinian armed struggle in pursuit of Statehood, declining to denounce terror.

□ 1345

Unbelievably, only six nations opposed the resolution.

But the United States, as ever, must stand with our ally. We must remind the world that the Israeli people have been prepared to give up land, to recognize a Palestinian state, to make other sacrifices to end hostilities and to return peace and security to the Jewish state.

That is why I join my colleagues here today. Peace has always been Israel's goal. In the words of David Ben-Gurion,

Israel's first prime minister, in the very declaration that established the state, and I quote, "We offer peace and amity to all neighboring states and their peoples. The State of Israel is ready to contribute its full share to the peaceful progress of the Middle East."

The Israeli people have been ready for peace, not just since Oslo in 1993, they have been ready for peace for 54 years. But peace requires a partner. It is clear that Yasir Arafat will not negotiate in earnest and will not keep his promises. He encourages suicide bombers. His actions threaten the security of Israel and the stability of the whole region. And they endanger our own country's war against terrorism.

My colleagues, we must remain actively and assertively engaged. Our message must remain unequivocal. Terror against any of us is terror against all of us, and it must stop.

Just as the United States decisively struck back against the terror perpetrated on our own shores, Israel must do the same. We have told Yasir Arafat what we expect, and he has met our requests with unreasonable demands and promises of violence. He has avoided real leadership, preferring to incite terror, hatred, and chaos. We must not bow to these tactics. I call on others in the region to put aside their dangerous flirtation with terror and push the Palestinian Authority towards the peace they claim to support. This is the only way progress can be achieved. The Israel-Palestinian conflict can no longer be a pressure valve for their failings and for the resentments of their people. They must save the region from its path of slow self-destruction.

Today, as this long and sad saga continues, Congress will reaffirm the strength of the United States-Israel relationship. Let there be no mistake why this friendship endures. We both cherish democracy. We are both committed to freedom of speech and human rights. And we stand together against terror. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

(Mr. PAUL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise to express some concerns about the process that we are going through today.

I am on the Committee on International Relations, and we have not yet had a chance to really debate this. This was brought up rather rapidly last night. We had to not break the rules but bend the rules a little bit to get this resolution to the floor. It seems like it would have been reasonable to bring this up next week, but there may have been some other reasons why this is being pushed through today.

Certainly this would not have been the State Department's first choice. In talking with the State Department, matter of fact, they expressed some real reservations about this. They said it is not a very helpful approach, and they said we need to work with the situation as it is to be an honest broker.

This legislation is one-sided and, therefore, not very helpful. So here we are, as a Congress, in a desire to please certain people, moving quickly, even though it may affect what is going on in the State Department. And the State Department goes on to say that this one-sided legislation just comes when in the past 48 hours or so we have been making some progress.

Even our chairman of the committee was quoted in the paper this morning of saying, well, if he had his way, he would prefer a more balanced resolution. And he is a very, very strong supporter of Israel. Of course, I would like to see a more balanced resolution, too. I would like to see one where we balance America's interests as well as others.

There is a lot of talk about democracy and peace. I take a position of nonintervention in the affairs of other people. I believe very sincerely that it is consistent with the Constitution and very sincerely that it works to our best interest for national security and for defense; and that even though this is intended very sincerely to help Israel, motions like this, resolutions like this, can very well backfire and actually hurt Israel more so than they will help.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the underlying resolution which supports Israel's response to the attacks on its people. For many years, in the early 1990s, I was one of the most outspoken Members of this body urging the United States and its European allies to act with force, if needed, to stop the slaughter and ethnic cleansing of the Muslim community in Bosnia-Herzegovina. I believe that we had a moral imperative to confront the Milosevic-inspired evil and to take action to stop it. I stood squarely with the Muslim community seeking international justice.

I do not choose to be evenhanded or neutral in the face of despots who preach death and destruction to others. I believe Yasir Arafat is such a despot. In the name of legitimate grievances, he and his terrorist allies employ grossly illegitimate means. We must bring peace to this savage region of our globe, but we must not achieve peace at the price of justice. Justice for Israel, the only democratic state in the region, and her people, and justice as well for the Palestinian people.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I join in supporting this resolution because I strongly support the right of Israel's people to eliminate the genesis of unconscionable terrorist attacks against innocent men, women and children. The State of Israel, like every other nation on earth, has the right of self-defense. This resolution is an expression of American solidarity with Israel as it acts to maintain and secure its independence as a free and sovereign nation.

At the same time, it is incumbent upon the United States as well as the

international community to continue to work with Israel and other States in the region to end this escalating cycle of violence, to relieve the suffering of all peoples of that region, and to work toward a permanent and stable peace. I absolutely believe the Israeli people share that goal. I pray that there are Palestinian leaders who share it as well. In his actions and his words, it is clear to me, however, that Yasir Arafat does not.

We must not shrink from our responsibility to stand for a just resolution of this continuing conflict, and we must surely avoid making muddled mistaken parallels between essentially justified defensive actions and terrorist tactics designed to inflame and destroy. We must be committed to helping the parties avoid violence and effect peace. We must be willing to help a Palestinian state realize economic stability. And we must be willing to be an honest broker to achieve these ends. But we must leave no doubt that we are absolutely and irrevocably committed to the survival of Israel and to its security and to its safety of its people. On that, my colleagues, there can be no neutrality.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to first of all thank the majority whip, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for their leadership in bringing forth this resolution.

As the men and women in uniform continue to fight our war against the terrorists in Afghanistan and continue to face resistance by al Qaeda forces, I think it is very important that we reflect upon the words of our President which he delivered on September 20. He said that any nation that continues to harbor or support terrorism will be regarded by the United States as a hostile regime.

I commend the President for these bold words and would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that our success in fighting this war depends upon America's preserving the precise definition of America's struggle. We cannot allow for exceptions or conditions. We cannot permit safe havens from which terrorists can operate with impunity. And we cannot shrink from our responsibility to support free nations under siege, especially Israel.

That is why we are here today, Mr. Speaker. The underlying resolution that we are here today to debate speaks very clearly of the failure by Mr. Arafat and his Palestinian Authority leadership to abide by the terms of the Oslo accords, to embrace non-violence and to renounce terrorism once and for all. Mr. Arafat has been unequivocal in his embrace of terrorism. The resolution points to the recent uncovering of evidence pointing to the direct financial support by Mr. Arafat and the Palestinian Authority to engage in the killing of innocent men, women, and children.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we speak up and speak up with a clear voice in this House; that we support Israel in its fight against the terrorists; and that there is no such thing as one terrorist being another's freedom fighter. The intentional killing of innocent men, women, or children will not be tolerated by this country.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN).

(Mr. ACKERMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today with a heavy heart, because with this resolution of solidarity the House formally acknowledges three critical policy failures:

First, we are owning up to the failure of our Nation's Pygmalion-like, romanticized notion that we could transform an Arab Che Guevara into a Palestinian Nelson Mandela. In the end, Yasir Arafat could not put down the gun.

Second, we are at last admitting that our policy of one more chance was understood by Yasir Arafat to mean that, no matter what, there would always be one more chance. We are declaring today that there are no more last chances.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we are acknowledging the failure of our countless efforts to squeeze from Mr. Arafat even the smallest commitment to non-violence. After trips by the Vice President, the Secretary of State, the CIA director, and the President's special envoy, Yasir Arafat still cannot put down the gun.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we are acknowledging failure. Not a failure of our making, nor one of our choosing. But this admission is the first step toward realizing our policy toward our ultimate goal of peace with security and a peace with dignity.

We are declaring today that there are no more last-chances left. His credibility is gone. His promises are hollow. The Congress, at least, has had enough.

Instead of sharing dreams of hope and plans of progress, as all great leaders have, he inspires young people to kill themselves to blow up babies and grandparents in pizzerias, or young girls going to a dance, or worshipers observing Passover. Nothing can justify the use of such evil depravity as a negotiating tool. He cannot put down the gun.

"Get re-involved," Mr. Arafat and the world told us. "Get re-involved and the violence will stop. And so we did. But he couldn't put down the gun."

In February 2001, President Bush sent Secretary of State Colin Powell to the Middle East and Arafat couldn't put down the gun. The Administration endorsed the Mitchell Committee report, and sent CIA Director George Tenet to facilitate implementation of the Mitchell report, and Arafat couldn't put down the gun. At the UN, President Bush called for a Palestinian state, and in a major speech, Secretary Powell elaborated on the President's vision, and Arafat couldn't put down the gun. The President sent General Anthony Zinni as his special

envoy, and the Vice-President offered to meet with Yasir Arafat, but Arafat couldn't put down the gun. The President sent Gen. Zinni again, and Arafat still couldn't put down the gun.

And finally, finally, after 19 months of daily drive-by-shootings, mortar attacks, rocket attacks and suicide bombings in restaurants, cafés, discos and religious observances, the people being murdered by Arafat's bombers said enough is enough. Israel has endured what no other nation would ever be asked to accept: the daily slaughter of its citizens by the very parties with whom others expected it to negotiate.

And so the IDF was sent into the hotbeds of Palestinian terrorism. And the results are quite clear. Just as our armed forces broke the back of Al-Qaida in Afghanistan, the Israeli Army has rightfully crushed the Palestinian terrorist infrastructure. Not surprisingly, there has been a real, sustained and significant reduction in Palestinian violence against Israel.

As did every Member of the House, I hoped that the Oslo agreement between Israel and the Palestinians would lead to peace. I still believe that peace is possible, but it is only possible if the Palestinians will finally put away the guns and bombs and seek their statehood at the bargaining table.

So yes, Mr. Speaker, we are acknowledging failure. Not a failure of our making, nor one of our choosing. But we are today recognizing a terrible truth: as it stands today, the Palestinian Authority is the author, solicitor, supporter, organizer and financier of Palestinian terrorism. In concert with Iran, it is an enemy of peace. And what about tomorrow? After all, it is the Middle East. Perhaps Mr. Arafat can be resurrected as a seeker of peace. But until then, what we have done has failed.

And this admission is the first step toward realigning our policy toward our ultimate aim: a just and lasting settlement between Israel and its Arab neighbors; a peace with security and a peace with dignity. Let us hope it begins today.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our whip, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), as well as the ranking Democratic member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for this resolution.

As President Kennedy said, "America is great not because we do the easy things. We are great because we do the hard things. A powerful Nation fields armies and commands fear. A great Nation advances justice and human freedom." Our foreign policy is best when it reflects our values, supporting democracies like Israel. Terrorists do not hate Israel because it is a Jewish state, they hate Israel because it is a free, open and democratic state in a region of dictators. Iran and Iraq, enemies of the Gulf War, unite against Israel because of her democratic model.

And after September 11, we speak with moral clarity that America supports democratic allies in the war on terror. Israel has always been ready to sign a peace, but when faced with a homicide bomber, that little democracy needs a bottom line, and we are that bottom line for Israel and the other democracies of this world.

In tough times, we served as the arsenal of democracy, and we serve as that again. I am proud when America defends our values, who share our freedom and democracy, and that is Israel. And I thank the gentleman for moving this resolution.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, here we go again. Here we go again. How many times has this body passed resolutions of this nature that are so unbalanced, so one-sided. That we become the laughingstock of the world? How many times have we passed resolutions of this nature? Yet do we have peace today? Do we have peace today?

I support the state of Israel. I do not support the brutal humiliating policies of Ariel Sharon. I support a strong relationship with Israel. That is not the issue here today. I support Israel being our ally. That is not the issue here today. Yes, Israel is our ally. Yes, we have had, we have today, and we will continue to have a strong relationship with Israel. But, by golly, we need other allies in the region as well.

What about the moderate Arab allies that want to help us, to whom we only cast further embarrassment today by the passage of these one-sided resolutions? Let us not shut the door. Let us not shut the door on those in the region who want to help us pressure Arafat to stop approving of these heinous acts of terrorism against civilians. Let us not shut the door on those allies of ours around the world, including the European Union, who want to help us, who want to help Israel stop these brutal acts against innocent civilians. And I deplore them as much as the next person.

There are those in the region that want to be our friends. Let us look at America's interests, number one. Let us look at America's interests. Are we furthering America's interests today by the passage of this one-sided, unbalanced resolution? Let us look around the world and ask ourselves that question.

I urge defeat of this resolution.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, prior to yielding to my friend from Colorado.

I would simply like to answer the question of whether it is in America's interests to pass this resolution today. When we stand with our friends, and when we reiterate our solidarity and our friendship with a nation that is our friend and that is under attack, the message that we are sending is that precisely we stand with our friends in good times and in bad times and that we are a friend worth having. And that is in the interest of the United States.

So because of our special friendship with Israel, because of the history of our friendship with Israel, and the ties

that bind us, and because we stand with our friends, we are passing this resolution.

□ 1400

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS).

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), who said it the best. When does it count being a friend? What is being a friend all about?

I heard the gentleman from Texas say why is this resolution necessary? I will tell Members why it is necessary, because the public relations machine in this world is rolling over Israel. They are making Yasir Arafat, who is a terrorist, look like Robin Hood.

Look at the Olympics. Take a look recently on Passover, when they send a bomber in to blow up a restaurant on Passover. The equivalent of that in the United States is showing up on Christmas Eve and killing Santa Claus. What do Members think we would be doing? We would be going after them.

Arafat is a terrorist. He was a terrorist 25 years ago, he was a terrorist 15 years ago, and he is a terrorist today. There is only one country in the world outside of the borders of Israel that has enough guts to stand up to that public relations machine and say enough is enough.

For those Members who have some sympathy for this cause, take a look at how these people speak in English. When they speak in English they speak in moderation. When they speak in their own language, they speak in extreme tongue. There should be no question whether or not this resolution is necessitated. It is necessitated by the fact, as the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) said, they are our friends and we will stand with our friends against this kind of aggression. There is no justification for what that terrorist is doing.

Finally, in summation, one of my colleagues said I wrote the President and the President did not write me back on my solution. Give me a break. President Bush is fully engaged in this. Condoleezza Rice is fully engaged, Colin Powell is fully engaged, as is the whole cabinet. This resolution deserves our yes vote.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, the House is right to condemn the horrific and heartless suicide bombings, and to reaffirm our support for Israel; but it is not right simply to voice our personal emotions and not to advance our national interests. This resolution should be stronger.

First, it should recognize the suffering of the Palestinian people. Many of the 1,500 Palestinians killed in this

conflict are not terrorists or fighters, but innocent people.

Second, Congress should forcefully support strong U.S. engagement in pursuit of a negotiated long-term settlement to the conflict. All suicide bombings cannot be stopped by the Palestinian authority alone, nor will they be ended by Palestinian incursions into the West Bank and Gaza. Terrorism was stopped before, and can be halted again only through joint Israel-Palestinian security cooperation.

Beyond that, the dream of a secure Israel can be realized only alongside a politically and economically viable Palestine. Our own national interests demand that the U.S. serve as an honest, credible leader towards peace.

Mr. Speaker, the House is right to condemn the horrific and heartless tactic of suicide bombing. The House is right to reaffirm the unbreakable bond between the American people and the Israeli people. But Mr. Speaker, it is not right to simply voice our personal emotions and not advance our national interests. This resolution should be stronger.

First, it should recognize the suffering of the Palestinian people. Many of the 1,500 Palestinians killed in this conflict are not terrorists or fighters, but innocent people. Surely, the United States of America and its Congress consider the death of an innocent child to be equally tragic—whether she is Israeli or Palestinian, Jewish, Christian, or Muslim.

Second, Congress should forcefully support strong U.S. engagement in pursuit of a negotiated long-term settlement to the conflict. We are here to offer solutions, not merely to express emotions. All suicide bombings cannot be stopped by the Palestinian Authority alone. Nor will they be ended by Israeli incursions into the West Bank and Gaza.

Terrorism was stopped before—and can be halted again—through joint Israeli-Palestinian security cooperation. Let us not forget that when Israel and the Palestinian Authority were combating terror together, under the watchful eye of our CIA, Israelis enjoyed three of the most peaceful years in their history. That ended when the peace process collapsed. These peaceful days will only return in the context of a vigorous, renewed peace process led by the United States. The dream of a safe and secure Israel can be realized only alongside an economically and politically viable Palestine. And this will only become reality if our country—and our President—is fully engaged in diplomacy.

Last night, the flames at the Church of the Nativity were a stark and vivid reminder that the cycle of violence in the Middle East threatens to spiral out of control. But the agreement to end the situation in Ramallah, secured by the United States, reminds us of the valuable role U.S. intervention can play.

Today, the United States is engaged in a critical war against terrorism. In my view, the fight against global terror will only be strengthened when we secure a just and lasting peace agreement between Israel and the Palestinians. For the sake of the Israeli and Palestinian peoples—and for our own sake—the U.S. government must be an honest, credible leader toward the path of peace. Our national interests give us no alternative.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to rise not only in support of this resolution, but to be one of the original cosponsors or one of the sponsors of the resolution.

Let me just point out that I do not have a large Jewish community in my district. The vast majority probably do not vote for me. I am not here to win friends, I am here to do what is right. This resolution speaks the truth. There are some people who are not going to be happy with this resolution. I can understand why, because it speaks the truth. It says “Yasir Arafat and the members of the Palestinian leadership have failed to abide by their commitments to nonviolence made in the Israel-PLO Declaration of Principles (the Oslo Accord).”

Jeepers, they have not only failed, Yasir Arafat goes on the radio calling for more martyrs. Young people strapping bombs around their waists going into restaurants and supermarkets, blowing up innocent women and children, and he is calling for more of that. To say he is a terrorist is an understatement. I mean, this resolution goes on to talk about the Karine-A affair, how they were trying to import into the Palestinian authority tons of weapons.

Mr. Speaker, we tend to gloss over the fact why we support Israel, and we will frequently just say Israel is a democracy, and then we move on to the next sentence. We need to dwell on that issue for awhile. To my knowledge, there have never been two democracies that have fought each other. There has never been a democracy that have done the horrible things the Palestinian authority has perpetrated against Israel. We have given the Muslim world a pass for too long. 1.2 billion people living under dictatorships where they have no freedom of speech, they have no freedom of religion, or political freedoms. This is the right resolution. This is the people's House. We listen to the people. The people want us to stand by Israel.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution, and say that I would have preferred Members to have had an opportunity to vote on H. Res. 405 by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support and proud cosponsor of H. Res. 392. Israel is under a state of siege from terrorist forces in the West Bank and Gaza. Palestinian offices in Ramallah harbored the accused assassins of an Israeli cabinet minister. The Palestinian authority proudly pays for posters to put up in

their cities glorifying these terrorist activities; they call them martyrs.

The way to peace in a Palestinian state is not through terror. If the Arab League wants to advance the peace process, they need to tell their membership to stop financing terrorism against Israel and stop demonizing the Jewish people. The Arab League needs to stop supporting terrorist organizations, stop funding suicide bombers on the West Bank and Gaza, and stop paying rewards for the attacks.

Everybody speaks about peace in front of the cameras, but continues to secretly fund terrorist organizations against Israel. I support Israel's right to defend their citizens and support their operations to destroy the terrorist infrastructure which has been created by the Palestinian Authority.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Arafat could stop the violence if he restrained his forces and used his powers for construction instead of destruction. Israel only went on the offensive as a reflexive action to stop escalating terrorist attacks. If there are no more attacks, Israel is more than willing to restart the peace process. This resolution needs to be passed.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER).

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution which is one-sided and will not further the cause of peace. This resolution undermines President Bush's efforts to bring both sides together as an honest broker. Instead of compromising, this one-sided resolution will encourage excesses on both sides. It is anti-peace.

Clearly all of us are overwhelmed with a sense of outrage over the terrorist bombings that have left so many Israeli women and children, elderly people and other noncombatants dead or wounded. Strapping a bomb onto a young person and sending them out to blow up a Pizza Hut or a bus and to kill other noncombatants in order to terrorize a population is despicable beyond words.

But if we are going to bring peace to that troubled region, we must be scrupulously honest. There are piles of bodies in the Middle East. Many of the victims are noncombatants, and both sides of the conflict have engaged in the slaughter of innocents. I know the retort that many will use that the elderly and the children that have been killed by the Israeli Army was unintentional. Collateral damage. I have searched my heart to accept this argument. I cannot accept it.

I am asking my colleagues to search their hearts. Should we not be doing what we can to end the cycle of violence as our President and Secretary of State have been trying to do? We must seek out the good-hearted people on both sides rather than encourage the radicals and hate mongers on both sides, which this resolution will do.

I am sorry, but I do not put Mr. Sharon and Mr. Arafat in the camp of the

good-hearted. The last thing we should do is give Mr. Sharon a green light to unleash his total war on the Palestinian people. The fact of life is that the Palestinians are not going to disappear, that Israel is not going to be driven into the sea. We need to bring both sides together in a spirit of peace and compromise. This resolution goes in the opposite direction.

No one has been more committed towards ending the Taliban and al Qaeda terrorist regime, or getting rid of Saddam Hussein than I have been. But this is a different situation, and we will fail unless we go at it as peacemakers. This is a pro-war resolution for a conflict that cannot be won. Let us be peacemakers and do the right thing.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

(Mr. CONYERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, there is not enough time for all Members to speak, but I include my remarks for the RECORD. And I would just add, there have been no hearings on the underlying resolution.

Mr. Speaker, for over a month I have worked more intensively on this controversy than on any of the other pressing matters before us. My effort has been to convince my colleagues that—despite the very strong feelings many of them have on this matter—it is crucial that we promote and engage in honest dialogue. That dialogue must be marked by as much mutual respect as we can muster, and by a continuing effort to understand viewpoints we may not share.

Finger-pointing, reciting historical claims and hurling charges may seem totally justified and important to express. But surely the goals of halting violence to achieve a resolution of the disputes requires that my words spoken here and my conduct are consistent with the necessity of having a dialogue in the Congress and in the Nation, as well.

Over the course of the last 5 weeks, I have spoken with many colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and on both sides of the capitol, urging that we create an inclusive forum in which different views could be freely expressed. On this controversial issue, it can truly be said, as Dr. King once reminded us, that: "We are caught in an inescapable network of mutuality, tied in a single garment of destiny."

My conversations have included the senior Senators from Delaware and South Dakota; the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE); the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL.) With the gentlelady from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), I have been convening a series of weekly meetings with colleagues, to which all members have been invited, and also attended by representatives of Jewish, Muslim, Protestant and Catholic religious institutions and organization deeply concerned about the Middle East crisis. All attendees at those meetings have agreed on the importance of maintaining real dialogue and minimizing emotional exchanges that are inflammatory or divisive.

I supported the creation of the State of Israel. My continuing support of its security, safety and viability has never wavered. At the same time, my dedication to America's playing its proper role in the pursuit of a just, equitable and lasting peace for all people in the region is equally well known.

I am sure that my colleagues share these goals but at this delicate time, I have concluded that this resolution, however well-intentioned, would be counterproductive to achieving them. I also am convinced that the Israeli Government and people know that the United States' commitment to their security and survival is steadfast and will remain so.

I agree, that this President, like his predecessors, should be given the maximum flexibility—to maintain the credibility of the United States with all parties and to preserve the ability to broker a permanent resolution, with equal conviction, I urge the President to use those capabilities to the fullest.

Mr. Speaker, it simply defies belief that, during these perilous times, the legislative bodies of the single nation on earth that can bring this crisis to closure would compromise that nation's ability to do so.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and resolution expressing solidarity with the state of Israel. Israel has been subject to the most horrendous series of terrorist attacks: Weekly suicide bombings targeting civilians in cafes, on buses and in markets; gunmen who go from home to home in search of innocent victims.

Today we resolve not only to support Israel in its time of need, our lone democratic ally in the region, but also to speak in a clear voice against the universal scourge of terrorism. As we saw on September 11, no nation, not even the most mighty, is immune from the poison of terrorism. We must realize that a threat to the life of civilians anywhere is a threat to civilization everywhere. I urge support of the resolution.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I pray for the peace of Jerusalem almost every day. As I listen to the gentleman from California speak about the tragic loss of life on both sides of this conflict, I know of his sincerity and greatly appreciate it.

But I rise today as an original cosponsor of the resolution; and more than that, I rise in support of the dream that is Israel. It is a dream that I would say with great respect to the Members of this institution of Jewish descent and ethnicity, that it is a dream shared by the overwhelming majority of all Americans, the dream that is Israel that languished for 1,800 years in the heart of the people known as the apple of God's eye.

It was a dream that in the wake of the brutality and the horror of the Holocaust, this Nation responded to, returning the people of Israel to their historic homeland in 1948, and there did

we become a partner with this nation, as no other nation partnered in the history of the world.

Yes, we should stand with Israel because she is the lone democracy in this part of the world. Yes, we should stand with Israel because she is a liberal democracy to boot. But mostly, Mr. Speaker, I believe we should stand with Israel today because this Congress is simply a megaphone for the heart of the American people.

□ 1415

This well should resonate with the hearts of our countrymen who believe in so many small buckboard churches that dot the landscape of districts like mine, that those who bless her, He will still bless, and those who cures her, He will cures.

Let us this day by this resolution send a deafening message from the heart of the American people to the world, that America stands with Israel in this, her darkest hour.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule and resolution. As Yasir Arafat plays the role of victim before the cameras of CNN, he continues to create a successor generation of Palestinian homicide bombers. These homicide bombers are indoctrinated by the curriculum of killing, the dialogue of death, the textbooks of terror poisoning the minds of the children of the West Bank and Gaza.

In the official textbook, "Our Country Palestine," it says, "There is no alternative to the destruction of the State of Israel." In the Palestinian textbook entitled, "Our Arabic Language," a subject for a composition is "How are we going to liberate our stolen homeland?"

Mr. Speaker, if one wishes to find a breeding ground of teenage suicide bombers, one need not look beyond the state-control of the Palestinian National Authority. Chairman Arafat's record should not be graded by his pathetic public relations hypocrisy, but rather by the progress he makes in second grade classrooms throughout the West Bank and Gaza.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I stand today without shame in support of this resolution. I stand today without shame in support of the ability of Israel to defend itself and to stand free and democratic. And I also stand without shame in recognizing the humanity and dignity of the Palestinian people. And for anyone to say that this resolution would act against peace and negotiations is wrong, because there is no way to prevent people

who truly want peace to come to the table and negotiate.

I believe we should have engagement. President Bush, it is vital that Secretary Powell should go with this Nation's full support back to the Mideast. President William Jefferson Clinton should be asked for his involvement in this enormous challenge. We must do all to ensure that peace occurs.

So today let me simply say that I want to speak in the words of the late Prime Minister Rabin, spoken at Oslo in 1994, "We are in the midst of building the peace. The architects and engineers of this enterprise are engaged in their work, even as we gather here tonight, building the peace, layer by layer, brick by brick. The job is difficult, complex, trying. Mistakes could topple the whole structure and bring disaster down upon us. And so we are determined to do the job well, despite the toll of murderous terrorism, despite the fanatic and cruel enemies of peace. We will pursue the course of peace," Mr. Speaker, "with determination and fortitude, and we will prevail."

That is what this vote stands for. We will prevail for peace and a free democratic and secure Israel and a freestanding peaceful Palestinian state. America is at its best when we can bring our power to bear to save lives and preserve the dignity of all peoples.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution. I believe in Israel and its right to self-defense with the understanding that Israel must be engaged in crafting a comprehensive and lasting peace agreement in the Middle East. We must also consider the humanity of the Palestinian people and the need for an in depth, thoughtful statement on how the violence in the Middle East must stop. The United States must be actively engaged in the peace process and broker a new understanding between the Israeli and Palestinian people. This type of peace agreement will take real compromise and risk on all sides and a strong and continued effort by the United States in shepherding the parties through the process.

In engaging in the peace process, the United States must use all the resources at its disposal in a way to be helpful, President Bush is vital, past President William Jefferson Clinton can bring much, and Secretary Colin Powell must return now to the Middle East with the full support of this nation. This is the type of event that history is made of, where historic agreements such as the Oslo Agreements with the Palestinians and the Treaty of Peace with Jordan arose. We need eloquent words indicating true peace and respect for life such as those spoken by Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin upon receiving the Nobel Peace Prize in Oslo in 1994,

We are in the midst of building the peace. The architects and the engineers of this enterprise are engaged in their work even as we gather here tonight, building the peace, layer by layer, brick by brick. The job is difficult, complex, trying. Mistakes could topple the whole structure and bring disaster down upon us. And so we are determined to do the job well despite the toll of murderous terrorism, despite the fanatic and cruel enemies of peace. We will pursue the course of peace with determination and fortitude. We

will not let up. We will not give in. Peace will triumph over all its enemies, because the alternative is grimmer for us all. And we will prevail.

We must also put these words into action. Positive action. We need to forge an agreement that renounces violence and terrorism, settles disputes through peace and negotiation, and acknowledges each peoples right to existence.

As I stated before, I believe in an Israeli state and a Palestinian state. I believe in the rights of the Palestinian people and the people of Israel. Some may believe we are favoring a friend and slighting another, and some may not agree with the words of this resolution, but we should not let this hinder our objective of peace. We must keep an eye toward a different future and give peace another chance. There must be on immediate close fire.

This resolution urges an unqualified opposition to all forms of terrorism and urges all parties in the region to pursue vigorously efforts to establish a just, and comprehensive peace in the Middle East.

This is the kind of effort and mindset we need to accomplish our goal. We know the role we must play to get rid of the poisonous past, the trail of blood and tears and forge a path to peace filled with hope and opportunity.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN).

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, my father was a refugee from Nazi Germany. If he had not made his way here and not made his way in America, I would not be standing here.

My story is the story of many Members, themselves refugees, like our friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), or the sons and daughters of refugees from oppressed places all over the world.

The only country in the world which always, always provides a homeland for Jewish refugees is Israel. As anti-semitism is on the rise all over the world, shockingly in France and Germany, Israel's existence and security becomes even more important.

President Harry Truman courageously recognized Israel 54 years ago and every administration since has strongly supported her. We must do so again today by strongly supporting this rule and this resolution. It is the moral thing to do. It is the strategic thing to do. It is the right thing to do.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, many of us will vote for H. Res. 392 because we do indeed wish to "express solidarity with Israel in its fight against terrorism." We are repulsed by the suicide terrorist attacks perpetrated by some Palestinian groups and gravely concerned by Chairman Arafat's failure to prevent such attacks and his encouragement of a violent uprising. The Israeli people need to know that they can count on the United States at this time of peril.

The resolution before us, however, falls far short of the kind of expression that might best contribute to stopping

the violence and moving toward a long-term settlement. The resolution appears designed to drive a "wedge" among friends of Israel for partisan purposes, and it risks misrepresenting the rationale behind the current efforts of President Bush and Secretary Powell to bring the parties together.

A more adequate resolution would reiterate our support both for the security and integrity of Israel and for justice and self-determination for the Palestinians. It would back a vigorous, sustained American peacemaking role. It would affirm Israel's right of self-defense, while noting the obligation to distinguish between uprooting terrorism and destroying the institutions and infrastructure of Palestinian self-government.

I regret, Mr. Speaker, that H. Res. 392 falls so far short. But its ninth clause captures a sentiment which I believe all of us share, urging "all parties in the region to pursue vigorously efforts to establish a just, lasting, and comprehensive peace in the Middle East."

May we as a body and as a government find ways to tirelessly advance this goal in the critical days and weeks ahead.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO). (Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the legislation. I had hoped to offer an alternative and speak and have not been allowed.

Mr. Speaker, I completely agree with my colleagues that Israel is the best friend of the United States in the Middle East. Israel is our most reliable ally in the Middle East. Israel is the only democracy in the Middle East. I consider myself a friend of Israel.

However, the increasingly hard line stance being taken by the Israeli Government, and the current military offensive being conducted by Prime Minister Ariel Sharon, will do nothing to bring about lasting peace in the region.

I am also concerned that the totally one-sided resolution being considered on the House floor today does nothing to enhance U.S. leadership in the region, and, in fact, could actually harm our ability to broker a permanent peace. I offered a truly balanced resolution, H. Res. 394, which would help send the message that the United States is committed to a negotiated settlement. Unfortunately, we are not being allowed to debate alternatives today.

I have been to Israel. I have seen first-hand how this emotional and complicated dispute manifests itself in the daily lives of Israelis and Palestinians. Both sides consider the actions of the other as illegal under international law. Both sides also consider the lands under dispute to be their ancestral home. And, both sides claim religious sites, particularly in and around Jerusalem, as their own. This conflict has no military solution.

Peace will never come to the region until all parties are committed to working toward the goal. I had thought that teenagers blowing up

other teenagers with suicide bombs might shake up the respective parties enough to stop the violence and begin permanent settlement negotiations. That is clearly not the case at this point.

Under no definition can Mr. Sharon or Mr. Arafat be considered men of peace. Neither can credibly claim the moral high ground.

Mr. Arafat has utterly failed in his multiple commitments to crack down on militants. He failed to seize an opportunity offered by President Clinton to create a Palestinian state. His leadership has been connected to terrorist organization.

But, prior to his election, Mr. Sharon intentionally visited a disputed holy site in Jerusalem in order to provoke a violent response. He has always been a vocal opponent of the Oslo Peace Process. He has advocated continued expansion of Jewish settlements in Palestinian territories. He ordered the Israeli military to reoccupy various Palestinian cities with weapons provided by United States taxpayers.

What this conflict needs is mature leadership. I commend President Bush for his April 4, 2002, statement in which he gave voice to the legitimate grievances of both sides. I was also relieved when the President sent Secretary of State Colin Powell to the region.

As President Bush noted in his April 4, 2002, speech, the parameters for a lasting resolution to this conflict are not really in dispute. What is lacking is the political will to reach a final settlement.

As the President, the Mitchell Commission, Saudi Arabia and the Arab League, the European Union and others have noted in similar ways, peace could be achieved through Arab recognition of Israel's right to exist, guaranteeing Israeli security approximately within its 1967 borders, creation of a viable Palestinian state, halting Jewish settlements in Palestinian territories, and sincere negotiations to determine the final status of Jerusalem and Palestinian refugees.

Mr. Speaker, we are at a dangerous crossroads in the Middle East. Unfortunately, there is no Itzak Rabin with a vision for peace.

Like all Americans, I unequivocally condemn acts of violence against both Israeli and Palestinian civilians.

I urge all parties to recognize that continued military attacks and terrorist activities will only lead to persistent, escalating violence with the potential to destabilize the entire Middle East.

I urge all parties to stop using state-controlled media or other means of propaganda to incite hatred and violence.

The United States must maintain sustained, high-level diplomatic engagement. The United States must bring the Israelis and Palestinians back to the negotiating table. It has become obvious to all but Sharon and Arafat and their most ardent followers that there is no military solution to this conflict. Hundreds of reservists in the Israeli Defense Forces are refusing to serve in the Palestinian terrorists because they understand there is no military solution.

I again commend the President and Secretary Powell for their efforts to mediate a peace and for their balanced view of the conflict.

I intend to vote against the unbalanced resolution on the floor today because it does nothing to advance peace.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not seek to pursue an evenhanded resolution. Mr. Arafat by his conduct does not deserve it. But this resolution makes all of its requests of the Palestinians, and none of Israel. It says nothing about the obligation of both parties under Resolution 242. It says nothing about the needs of Israel in the context of a final settlement to withdraw from settlements. It says nothing about the willingness to support a Palestinian state in the context of a full settlement.

It therefore, in my view, makes it harder for us to be seen as a fair-minded broker, and it makes it more difficult for the administration to persuade the Arab world to take the actions they must take to achieve peace; and that in the end hurts Israel, it does not help it.

I am going to ask people to vote "no" on the previous question so I can offer an alternative, the text of H. Res. 405, which makes clear our support for Israel in a more constructive way.

I fully support Israel's right to defend itself, but I do not support Mr. Sharon's efforts to hang onto the settlements and crush legitimate Palestinian nationalism.

This gag rule on the House this afternoon does no credit to this body.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I include the text of H. Res. 405 that I would offer if the previous question is defeated, as well as the text of a Washington Post editorial on the subject.

H. RES. 405

Whereas recent events in the Middle East, triggered by recent Palestinian suicide bombings, have created conditions under which the reestablishment of a nonviolent environment is highly unlikely without the active sustained leadership of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) stands in solidarity with Israel's right as a frontline state in the war against terrorism to take military action to end terrorist attacks, to dismantle terrorist infrastructure, and to provide security for its people;

(2) remains committed to Israel's right to self-defense and to assisting Israel in exercising that right;

(3) will continue to assist Israel in strengthening its homeland defenses;

(4) condemns Palestinian suicide bombings and the ongoing support and coordination of terror by Yassir Arafat and other members of the Palestinian leadership;

(5) insists that the Palestinian Authority fulfill its commitment to dismantle the terrorist infrastructure in the Palestinian areas;

(6) urges all Arab states, particularly United States allies Egypt and Saudi Arabia, to declare their unqualified opposition to all forms of terrorism, particularly suicide bombing, and to act in concert with the United States to stop the violence;

(7) urges Israel to make clear, in the context of the full settlement described in paragraph (8), its willingness to withdraw from occupied territories; and

(8) urges all parties in the region to vigorously pursue efforts to establish a just, lasting, and comprehensive peace in the Middle

East that will enable Israel and an independent Palestinian state to exist within the context of full and normal relationships, which should include termination of all claims or states of belligerency and respect for and acknowledgment of the sovereignty, territorial integrity, and political independence of every state in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 24, 2002]

TERRORISM AND NATIONALISM

ISRAELI PRIME MINISTER ARIEL SHARON has insisted that his army's offensive in the West Bank has been aimed at uprooting the infrastructure of Palestinian terrorism, in the same way that the United States has used military force to drive al Qaeda from Afghanistan. That seems a worthy goal, and to some a valid comparison—and yet it doesn't explain why Israeli troops would have raided and deliberately destroyed the civilian ministries of the Palestinian Authority in Ramallah. At the Ministry of Higher Education, the Israelis stripped all the computers of their hard drives, then piled them together and blew them up. They also destroyed Palestinian television studios, knocked down radio antennas and looted Palestinian banks. Perhaps some of these acts were carried out by undisciplined troops. But the pattern of destruction also suggests a crucial distinction between Israel's campaign and that of the United States. Both invasions are aimed at crushing terrorist organizations that have carried out savage attacks on innocent civilians. But Israel also has another target: the Palestinian national movement, which aims at ending the Israeli military occupation of the West Bank and Gaza Strip and creating a Palestinian state in its place.

The problem with equating Israel's campaign against terrorism with that of the United States, as Mr. Sharon and some of his American supporters do, is that it overlooks this contest for territory and sovereignty underlying the Israeli-Palestinian bloodshed. Though it has been contaminated by suicide bombings and other acts of terrorism, the Palestinian national cause and its goals are recognized as legitimate by the Bush administration and the United Nations, and they were tacitly accepted by Israel when it signed the Oslo accords of 1993. Mr. Sharon and most of the rest of his government, however, have never accepted Oslo; on the contrary, they have devoted most of their lives to the dream of permanently establishing Israel's control over most, if not all, of the territories it occupied during the 1967 Six Day War. Few outside of Israel support that plan, but Mr. Sharon and his allies have for decades argued that Israeli occupation and settlement of the Arab lands were necessary to control the Palestinian threat to Israel.

The disastrous decision of Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat not to accept a negotiated settlement of Palestinian claims and his subsequent encouragement of a violent uprising against the Israeli occupation have justified an Israeli response. But they have also given Mr. Sharon and other Israeli nationalists the cover to pursue their own unacceptable ambitions. In the name of uprooting terrorism, they have systematically destroyed the institutions and infrastructure of Palestinian self-government. To back the Israeli invasion, as the Bush administration has mostly done, is not just to back the cause of counterterrorism, it is also to abet Mr. Sharon's drive to suppress Palestinian national rights.

The Bush administration's uncompromising opposition to terrorism following

Sept. 11 is politically and morally powerful and has yielded impressive results, both in Afghanistan and in many other parts of the world. Nevertheless, if counterterrorism is to remain an effective cause, the administration must discriminate between terrorism and the sometimes legitimate political causes it is used for; and it must also differentiate between legitimate defense against terrorism and attempts to use counterterrorism to justify unacceptable aims. The Israeli writer Amos Oz has observed that Israel is engaged in two separate campaigns against the Palestinians—a legitimate war against terrorism and an “unjust and futile” bid for control of the West Bank and Gaza. The Bush administration needs a policy that can tell the difference between the two.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, this has been an interesting debate today. I think it is very appropriate that this resolution is before us. It is a very important vote. Obviously, the vote on the previous question is a key vote.

What the proponents of this resolution, of which I am a proud cosponsor, are saying is basically let others be neutral. We should never be wary of standing with Israel. We should never be wary of standing with our friends, even when we are alone. That is one of the distinguishing and most honorable characteristics of this great Nation.

So with this vote today this Congress will be telling Israel that they can count on us; that Israel, our friend, can count on this Congress, can count on the United States of America. So I would urge all of my friends, all of my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, to support this resolution.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 404, Expressing Solidarity with Israel. While some measures of this resolution may be accurate, it only provides one side of the story.

This resolution condemns the use of terrorism by Palestinians. I too, condemn these acts. This resolution also condemns Chairman Arafat for failing to take action to prevent terrorists from operating out of territory under his control. I also condemn this failure.

However, this resolution fails to condemn the excessive use of force by the Israeli government, it fails to call on Israel to allow United Nations investigators to go to the Refugee camp in Jenin to investigate accusations of human rights violations, and it fails to call on both sides to go back to peace talks to resolve their differences.

I am disappointed that the House Leadership brought this resolution to the floor instead of House Resolution 494, introduced by my friend Congressman DEFazio, of which I am an original cosponsor. H. Res. 494 is a balanced resolution that condemns the violent acts of both parties in this conflict, calls on both sides to protect human rights observers and aid workers, and calls on both sides to comply with United Nations Security Council Resolutions.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution not because of what it says but for what it does not say.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, my vote in solidarity with the State of Israel should not be read as a vote in solidarity with policies of

Ariel Sharon that I view as misguided and counterproductive. My support for Israel is longstanding, but Ariel Sharon is not “Israel.” He was wrong in rejecting the successful peace process in Oslo, in rejecting President Clinton's efforts at Camp David in 2000, in rejecting the talks between Israelis and Palestinians at Taba, Egypt in January 2001, and he was wrong in Sabra and Shatila. Without approving in any way actions of some of his adversaries or condoning their violence, he is wrong in continuing to reject measured answers to the Middle East crisis.

New York Times columnist Tom Friedman, hardly a Palestinian advocate, recently wrote: “Many Israelis feel Mr. Sharon is so paralyzed by his obsession with eliminating Mr. Arafat, by his commitment to colonial settlements and by his fear that any Israeli concession now would be interpreted as victory for the other side that he can't produce what most Israelis want: a practical, non-ideological solution.”

A “non-ideological solution” is what this land—so small in size, and so great in meaning—requires. It is the spirit embodied both in the courageous efforts of Secretary of State Colin Powell and in our country's United Nations vote for Security Council Resolution 1397 “affirming a vision of a region where two States, Israel and Palestine, live side-by-side within secure and recognized borders.”

This is not the resolution that I would have drafted, but no amendments were permitted to it. This resolution fails to recognize the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian people to live in peace and security or to acknowledge that innocent Palestinians also lost lives and homes.

As Secretary Powell has indicated, this particular resolution “would be very unhelpful.” It does not advance security for families threatened by violence, it may only lessen our ability to serve as an honest broker to secure a more lasting peace for all who suffer.

The Administration's months of inattention, indecision, and unwillingness to engage in the Middle East made a bad situation worse. Mr. President, heed Secretary Powell and General Zinni's counsel. Lead our foreign policy yourself—do not cede this critical mission to Ariel Sharon and TOM DELAY.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, due to the start of the celebration of Greek Orthodox Easter and religious obligations in my district, I was unable to cast a vote on roll call 126. Had I been present, would have voted “yea” on H. Res. 392.

I strongly support Israel's right to defend its citizens and applaud their quest for peace. Israel is exercising its right to act in self-defense against the suicide bombings and other attacks on Jews. This is the time for the United States to stand with Israel, our ally for several decades, and to express our support for ending the violence in Israel.

Israel must squash the terrorism within its borders in order to maintain its status as a free, democratic and civilized society. Our pledge to eradicate terrorism everywhere it occurs should be taken seriously, and Israel should be commended for having chosen to help us.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express solidarity and sympathy with the people of Israel, but also with innocent Palestinians who have suffered violence and injury. I believe it is important for Congress to condemn in the strongest terms terrorism wherever it occurs. I also strongly believe that the

U.S. must not forget that the highest goal of our foreign policy in the Middle East should be forging a lasting peace agreement. The U.S. must work toward a lasting peace for the vast majority of Israeli and Palestinian people who are non-violent and only seek peace and stability.

In its effort to help establish a concrete agreement for peace, the U.S. must first work aggressively through diplomatic channels with the Palestinians and the Israelis to help negotiate a cease-fire. All people in the Middle East deserve to live their lives in peace and security. Yet, only with a cease-fire and a reduction of fear and anger will there be any hope of future peace talks.

The goal of a lasting peace agreement is why the resolution that Congress is considering today should not be defeated. If this resolution were to fail, the wrong message would be sent to the people of Israel. The U.S. Congress would be seen as turning its back on the people of the Middle East in this time of horrible violence. The resolution's failure would have a dampening effect on America's ability to successfully negotiate a cease-fire, and eventually a lasting peace agreement that will benefit all the people of the Middle East.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I support H. Res. 392 in its expression of American solidarity with the people of Israel, our closest and most reliable ally in the region. I also support its declaration of our country's long-standing commitment to ensuring Israel's right to exist and its right to security in the region, although this commitment has never been in question. Given those two points, I will vote in favor of this resolution.

But at the same time, I am also deeply troubled by the timing of this resolution and the fact that it expresses no concern over the decades-long plight of the Palestinian people and their struggle for independence and security. Additionally, this resolution condemns only the sins of one side of this conflict, despite the fact that both parties share responsibility for the massive escalation of violence in the region over the last 18 months. Nor does this resolution provide any encouragement for either party to return to the negotiating table to work out a fair and lasting peace. Because of that, my vote in favor of this resolution comes with extreme reluctance.

I question the wisdom of the House Leadership for forcing a vote on this resolution at this time. This resolution has the potential to derail the current peace initiatives being offered by their own Republican Administration, initiatives that I and the vast majority of the American public support. It also has the potential of inflaming extremists on both sides to continue the violence, if the United States is perceived as a biased influence. This would be a disaster for both the Israeli and Palestinian people.

The United States has many vital strategic, economic and political interests in the Middle East. These vital nations interests require that the United States reconcile its simultaneous commitments to ensuring the security of the State of Israel; to supporting Arab allies to achieve regional stability; and to containing the proliferation of non-conventional weapons.

That is why a lasting peace between Israelis and Palestinians is an imperative and not merely an option for the United States. The U.S. goal of achieving regional stability, including security for Israel, is impossible without a

comprehensive resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. I hope this resolution does not impede us from reaching that goal.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, not because it is perfect, or even because it is as balanced as it could be. I support this resolution because it says something that needs to be said and can never be repeated enough. It states, once again, that terrorism cannot and will not be tolerated, no matter where it occurs. Mr. Speaker, the series of suicide attacks that have been perpetrated by Palestinian terrorist networks against the people of Israel are attacks against hope itself, and they must be condemned in the strongest possible terms.

But Mr. Speaker, the efforts to rebuild hope has to begin with the realization that violence will never bring peace. Israel certainly has a right to defend itself, but it cannot assume that it will be able to beat the Palestinian people into submission. Palestinians need to have their dignity recognized, just like any of us. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we often ignore the fact that many of the 1400-plus Palestinians killed in this violence were civilians who, like the rest of us, only want to build a home and family and live in peace with their neighbors. Let us be clear: we will not support the domination of one people by another. We do not believe that people should have to live in subjugation to their neighbors simply because of their place of birth, their religion, the language they speak, or their ethnicity. We affirm the rights of both Palestinians and Israelis to live side by side in a state of peace, and I, along with many of my colleagues have stated that principle over and over again.

Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues, I cling to a hope that peace in the Middle East will one day become a reality. I have personally committed myself to the issue of middle East peace, trying to reinvigorate the hope that seems to have been lost during the past year and a half of violence. I will continue to be sincere in my efforts. I urge my colleagues to examine their own hearts on this issue, and move forward in a way that is constructive and helpful. Peace is possible, Mr. Speaker, but it will take a courageous effort from everyone to make it so.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am compelled to vote "present" on H. Res. 392 because I believe that consideration of this resolution is premature.

Secretary of State Colin Powell is in the midst of delicate negotiations to bring about a cease-fire and return all parties to the negotiating table. I strongly support this mission to bring a lasting peace to the Middle East.

I also firmly believe Israel's right to defend itself against terrorism and denounce the brutal Passover suicide bombing, which killed 28 people and injured nearly 150. However, the Administration's peace initiative must be given time to work.

At this point, Congress should support the Secretary's peace mission and not pass a resolution that could undermine these efforts. As Americans, we all must work together to end the acrimonious relationship between the Israelis and the Palestinians.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, during these delicate times of instability, I do not believe that this Congress should be voting on a resolution regarding the conflict between Israel and the Palestinian territories.

I believe that this resolution we are debating today—H. Res. 392—does not serve any

great purpose but only serves to undermine the Administration's efforts to negotiate a peaceful settlement to the conflict in the Middle East.

Our overall mission should be a resolution to the fighting; debating this measure at this time does not accomplish that mission.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in unwavering support of House Resolution 392 to reaffirm strong relations between the United States and Israel.

The U.S. has a unique relationship with Israel—the only democratic nation in the Middle East. We must continue to support nations with similar ideological goals and that share the same commitment to democratic principles. Our history of friendship spans many decades, and the U.S. has been one of the strongest advocates for efforts to craft a long-term peace settlement in the region. We cannot waiver from our commitment to stability in the area, and the U.S. should serve as a facilitator for peace negotiations.

Recently Israel's people have suffered from unspeakable acts of cruelty. The United States, still healing from the attacks of September 11, must stand by Israel in these difficult times. I strongly condemn the acts of radical Palestinian groups that use violence against civilians, a tactic that we cannot tolerate. In February, I called on the President to add the al-Aqsa Martyrs' Brigade, the Tanzim, and Force 17 to the international list of terrorist groups. These organizations are responsible for countless attacks on the Israeli people, and the United States must take action against them.

I also call upon Chairman Arafat to curb these attacks, to denounce such acts of terror, and to reiterate his support for peace. Until the violence abates, I support Israel's right to take reasonable action to defend itself and its citizens from further harm.

We must continue our efforts in Congress to promote peace in the Middle East and maintain a strong United States-Israel relationship. I urge all of my colleagues to vote for the resolution before us today.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 392 and in support of efforts to bring lasting peace and security to the Middle East. The United States Congress today will, once again, reinforce its bond and our nation's bond with the people of Israel. I am proud to join my colleagues in sending this message of support for our close ally and friend, the State of Israel.

A short time ago, as families and as a people, Jews retold the story of our Exodus from slavery in Egypt. And Jews everywhere vowed, "Next year in Jerusalem," because Jerusalem belongs to all of us. We tell that story to remind ourselves and our children how we once were slaves and now we are free.

A few weeks ago, we remembered the six million slaughtered in the Holocaust. We wept together and Jews everywhere vowed, "Never again." We tell that story to remind ourselves and our children that even now, especially now, we cannot take our freedom for granted.

A few days ago, we celebrated the 54th anniversary of the establishment of our beloved State of Israel, the tiny spot on this planet where Jews everywhere know that, no matter what, we can go there and be free.

And today we gather here to make a commitment to freedom: that Israel will thrive and shine as a democratic, Zionist, Jewish homeland now and forever.

The resolution before us today tells our brothers and sisters in Israel that we stand with them; that we will not stand idly by while they are murdered by terrorists during a Pesah seder, or waiting for a bus, or going to a restaurant, shopping at a mall, going to a café or sleeping in their beds. We will walk with them, and we're doing that today, every step of the way.

Our message today to those who would desecrate our synagogues or attack our children in France or Belgium or the Ukraine or Canada or Los Angeles or Chicago: "Never again" will we allow your anti-Semitism to threaten our lives and our freedom, and we will hold any government that tolerates anti-Semitism accountable for its actions or inaction.

Last week at the AIPAC Conference in Washington, attended by hundreds of people from Illinois, you could also see in attendance, the largest gathering of members of the U.S. House and Senate anywhere outside of a joint session of Congress. Over half of the U.S. Senators were there; over one-fourth of the 435 members of the House. This is unprecedented. They were there because they stand firmly with us as friends of Israel.

This outpouring of support did not happen by accident. It is a tribute to the Jewish community, to our organizations, all of the synagogues, institutions and individuals, and their decades of work that so many of my colleagues, even those from states with small Jewish populations, understand the importance of Israel and the U.S./Israel relationship. Because of that diligence, the day in, day out educating of policy makers, I know that the United States of America will always, ALWAYS, stand firmly with Israel. I will never allow that bond to be broken.

Let me end by quoting some of the words spoken by Rabbi Michael Melchior, Israel's Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, at the incredible rally in Washington, D.C. two weeks ago. He referred to a Torah portion that describes the Biblical laws of holiness. "The climax of these laws," he said, "the peak of holiness is remarkable. It is the simple commandment—'Love your neighbor because he is as yourself.' This is Jewish holiness. We will never accept those who prevent this holiness, who subscribe to a doctrine of 'Kill your neighbor with yourself.' This fight seems overwhelming. A raging sea of violence ready to engulf us, and many of us have moments of despair. But our people, from its earliest days of creation have found ways of crossing such seas. I pray and truly believe that if we keep sight of the values for which we are fighting, we will cross this sea as well as reach the land of which we have so long dreamed, the land of peace."

I urge all members to support this resolution. With its passage we make clear the U.S. commitment to the people of Israel. We will stand with Israel forever and we will guarantee that the people of Israel are free to live in peace and security. Today more than ever we need to reinforce that commitment. Passage of this measure joins the United States with all friends and allies of the people of Israel in saying Am Yisrael Chai! The people of Israel will continue to live—now and forever.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 392.

As Israel and its citizens undergo a daily bombardment from terrorists and suicide

bombers, we have an opportunity to stand in support of the only democracy in a desert of despotism. It is our responsibility to be the brokers for peace in the Middle East and ensure that two homelands exist—one for Israel and one for the Palestinians. But we cannot allow our pursuit of peace to ignore this rampage of Palestinian terror.

One of the most important moments in our modern history with the Middle East occurred in 1981. Israel knew that Saddam Hussein's Iraq was developing the Osirak nuclear reactor—the future of their nuclear weapons program. Israel had the prescience to deny Saddam Hussein the capacity to set up a nuclear bomb factory in Iraq when it sent a dozen F-16 fighters over the Saudi Desert to destroy the Osirak nuclear reactor. Israel was flogged with criticism from the world community, including the United States in a United Nations resolution.

Israel should have been commended, not reprimanded for taking out Osirak. This move set Saddam's Iraq's nuclear program back decades—the same Saddam who today will pay \$25,000 to the family of each suicide bomber who kills innocent Israelis. Should we stand with Israel, when the rest of the world condemns it? Yes. Israel is our only Middle East, democratic ally against terrorism and nuclear proliferation. Vote yes on this resolution and stand in solidarity with Israel.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, my ongoing medical treatment required my return to New Jersey today prior to the vote on H. Res. 392—Expressing solidarity with Israel in its fight against terrorism. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on this important measure.

Today the House of Representatives stands in solidarity with the people of Israel. The United States knows no more valuable ally in the Middle East than the nation Israel. The goals of our two democracies are identical: peace and freedom.

Today, our nation also stand for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. We cannot wait idly while such violence continues in the Middle East. Mothers, fathers, and children have been slaughtered and terrorist attacks drive Israelis and Palestinians further and further apart. Peace cannot be negotiated in an atmosphere of terror.

I support the recent peace mission undertaken by Secretary of State Colin Powell at the director of President Bush and I urge the Bush Administration to continue its active involvement in the peace process in the region. The President and his Administration should know that he has the support of Congress for his efforts in the Middle East and the war on terror.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise with sincere concerns about H. Res. 392. We should not be bringing this type of one-sided resolution to the floor now. Instead, we should be working on a resolution that encourages peace.

The United States does not need a political resolution to show that it is a friend of Israel. America has proven it is a friend of Israel, and I personally count myself as a long and loyal friend of Israel. But I am not pleased with the behavior of either side—Israel or the Palestinian Authority—right now.

When friends allow a fight to continue that neither side can win, inaction only prolongs the violence and killing. We must not allow our

aversion to inaction spur us to unhelpful resolutions that do not help our friends. I will vote "Present" on H. Res. 392 because this unbalanced resolution does not benefit our friends. Instead, it fans the flames of hatred.

That is one of the reasons I am a cosponsor of Congressman DeFAZIO's resolution, H. Res. 394. That resolution is a balanced attempt to bridge the gap between the two sides in this conflict. The United States' approach must be evenhanded if we are to move the peace process forward. Languishing in a cycle of blame over the mistakes of both sides is counterproductive. We must recognize that all parties have made mistakes, and instead of rehashing what they have done wrong, start thinking about what they can do better in the quest for peace.

As in the DeFazio resolution, we must recognize that the first step toward peace is stopping the violence being perpetrated by all parties. Israel's recent incursions into Palestinian-controlled territories have caused extraordinary hardship for innocent Palestinians and exacerbated the crisis. Likewise, the Palestinian suicide bombing attacks against Israel cannot be justified and the Palestinian leadership must do more to prevent these murderous attacks.

We absolutely must support Israel's right to exist and defend itself as a sovereign state, but do so while also recognizing the Palestinian right to self-determination. In order for the U.S. to be an honest broker, it is extraordinarily important that we retain the trust of both sides. Only then will we be able to advance the cause of peace.

Peace will be achieved only when Israeli citizens are secure in their homes and shops, when the Arab nations recognize Israel's right to exist, and when the Palestinian people have a state of their own. Acknowledging that the conflict may not be resolved soon, no option should be eliminated, including the possibility that international observers help maintain peace in the region.

With emotions running high on both sides, acting as an honest broker requires courage, leadership and risking the temporary anger of both sides. But we must, because America is the world's best hope for peace.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution as one symbol of my solidarity with the nation of Israel as well as all those engaged in a momentous struggle against terrorism. Simply put, Israel has a right to defensible borders and a right to live in peace with its neighbors. Thus, the United States has a moral imperative to assist Israel in its defense.

In its 54 years of existence, Israel has been fighting an ongoing war against terrorists who sought to destroy her. These terrorists do not understand human mercy and kill indiscriminately men, women and children in service of a political cause that is the destruction of the Jewish state.

We were all heartened by President Clinton's attempt to create peace between Israelis and Palestinians beginning in 1993. But, unfortunately the Palestinians could not surrender their goal of eliminating Israel and pushing her citizens into the sea.

Almost 10 years after the Oslo process began we are facing the nightmare scenario for Israel. Attacked by terrorists inside her borders and from surrounding countries Israel has found little peace.

Much like our own war against terrorism, this effort pits a democratic society against a leader that uses murder as a regular type of statecraft. This resolution is important for the message that it sends to our embattled ally Israel, to her citizens, and to all our democratic friends around the world.

America stands by fellow democracies who share our values and our way of life. And, strong U.S. leadership is the best hope for bringing about a political process that can eventually pave the way for security and peace.

Knowing that we must do something to stop the violence, I call out to all peace-loving people throughout the region, especially those in Arab countries, who seek a better life for their children and grandchildren, a vibrant economy, and meaningful commerce and exchange, to join us in our quest for peace.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is important because the message it sends will ring throughout the world wherever democracies are fighting terrorists and I urge its immediate passage.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, while I agree with the sentiments expressed by many of my House colleagues about the need for Israel to defend itself, I do not think that this is the right time for Congress to take sides in the Israel-Palestine affair. In foreign affairs America should speak with one voice. The president has said that this resolution only complicates an already complicated situation in the Middle East. Instead of having a separate congressional message, I believe we should be giving the President greater leeway to act as an honest broker between the Israelis and Palestinians and formulate a policy that will stop the violence and get negotiations going forward.

On April 10, I met with former Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu to discuss the current fighting in the Middle East. He stressed the difficulty of negotiating with the Palestinians, and warned that if the suicide bombings in Israel do not stop, then they may spread to the United States with 'suitcase bombs.' But the U.S., as a military superpower and an economic superpower as well, can exert considerable pressure on both sides to encourage a resolution.

Secretary of State Colin Powell confronted an almost intractable set of problems on his peace mission to the Middle East. The Israeli government continues to occupy parts of the Palestinian Authority's territory despite requests to desist and withdraw from President Bush. Too many governments in the region, including Yasser Arafat's Palestinian Authority, are ambiguous at best on their commitment to end terror. Although some Arab states have helpfully indicated their willingness to accept Israel, too many still confuse murder with martyrdom.

When the United Nations mandated the creation of Israel and Palestine out of British-controlled territory in 1947, it offered to partition the land between a Jewish state of Israel and an Arab-controlled Palestine. That offer was rejected then, and though Israel was limited to the area of the proposed partition, a coalition of Arab states including Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Iraq, and Jordan immediately attacked. Israel prevailed in that war, however, as it did in the subsequent wars of 1967 and 1972. Although Egypt and Jordan have signed peace treaties with Israel, the other Arab countries maintain a state of "cold" war with Israel.

The situation is further confused by land Israel captured in various conflicts, primarily the 1967 war. In that fight, Israel captured the West Bank and Gaza, including Jerusalem. The Palestinian Authority now occupies the bulk of that territory as a result of the Oslo peace process. Israel offered nearly all of that territory two years ago for the creation of a Palestinian state. That offer was rejected, sparking the present conflict.

The current cycle of violence in the region must not continue. The killing and bloodshed on both sides is blocking a resolution to the conflict and an end to our war on terrorism. Most everyone from Palestine and Israel has had a friend or relative injured or killed by the other side. The hatred that exists on both sides will not be easily overcome. For its part, the Palestinian Authority and the Arab world should take strong action to curb the mindless violence of suicide bombers. A Palestinian state should be established and the Arab world should accept the suggestion of Crown Prince Abdullah bin Abdul Aziz of Saudi Arabia to recognize Israel. At the same time, Israel must withdraw from Palestinian Authority territory as the President has requested. Accomplishing these acts, however, will not reduce the hatred. I see a need to build some physical separation between the two states until the animosity can subside.

The President is demonstrating bold leadership and wants results. An anxious world also wants results, especially the suffering innocents in Israel and Palestine.

We need to speak with one voice and that is why I am voting no on this resolution.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 392, expressing our nation's solidarity with Israel in our joint battle against terrorism throughout the Middle East and the world.

Unfortunately, because of a family medical emergency I was unable to cast a vote for the rule to consider this resolution and for the resolution itself. My vote earlier today though, for the previous question, to allow for the consideration of this legislation is indicative of my strong support for the House's expression of unity with Israel and the Israeli people.

The American and Israeli people continue to be the primary targets of cowardly terrorist cells and I stand with the people of Israel in ensuring their right to defend their homeland and their citizens from these attacks. This resolution today is one more signal to the world that our two great nations are allied in the effort to bring about peace and rid the world of terrorists. We must never waiver in that fight if we are to succeed and I pledge my continuing support.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 392, legislation expressing solidarity with Israel in its fight against terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the September 11th attacks, Americans have come to understand the struggle for security from the threat of domestic terror that so consumes the Israeli government and its people. This resolution comes at a crucial time in the history of both our nations. Israel, having just observed its 54th anniversary, continues the fight for its very survival while the U.S., engaged in its own full-scale war on terrorism, seeks to secure its own borders. H. Res. 392 recognizes our common struggle with Israel against terrorism, the enormous human toll the people of

Israel have suffered, and the efforts of Israel's government to thwart future attacks by Palestinian organizations determined to inflict the most possible damage on the people of Israel. The message from this body is one of unity and is meant to reverberate in every corner of the world, especially those that harbor the enemies of peace and democracy.

H. Res. 392 expresses our strongly-held belief that Israel has a right to defend itself, just as we have sought to do. Mr. Speaker, throughout Israel's existence—one constant has guided every administration—the desire to live in peace with its neighbors. The 1993 OSLO Accord set forth a path for peace. I must reiterate this point—since that time Israel has consistently expressed the willingness to give up sovereign land to live in peace with its Palestinian neighbors. The same cannot be said for Israel's would-be peace partner—Yasser Arafat. The violence of current intifada was triggered by President Arafat's rejection of Prime Minister Ehud Barak's offer of a comprehensive settlement at Camp David in 2000. Arafat continues to incite terror with statements like "Oh god, give me a martyrdom like this" which he said after the Passover suicide bombing that killed 27 and wounded hundreds of innocent Israelis.

Mr. Speaker, civilian casualties are the horror endured by both sides but we must not lose sight of the fact that all of this death and destruction was completely avoidable. At every turn the Palestinian Authority could have chosen peace but, time and again, have supported terror as a mode of achieving their political goals. Mr. Speaker, as we express our solidarity with the government and people of Israel, I come back to one fundamental truth, even as the very existence of the State of Israel is threatened, there is always a path to peace. It may be more difficult to see, and harder still to traverse, but it exists. If falls upon us to help the parties find and travel that road. In the meantime, let the world hear this strong proclamation of support for our good friend Israel during these difficult times.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, today we should be here to focus on what all sides involved in the Middle East have in common and what can be applied from our experience here in this country to achieving solutions to the conflict between the Palestinians and the Israelis. We should not be here to blame one side over the other, but to seek solutions leading to the peaceful coexistence between Israelis and Palestinians.

The struggle between the Israelis and the Palestinians is one of the most enduring and explosive of all the world's conflicts.

For the Jewish people of Israel, the return to the land of their forefathers after centuries of persecution around the world has not brought peace or security. Israel has faced and continues to face crisis after crisis.

Palestinians argue that over the last 54 years they have seen colonization, expulsion and military occupation in their difficult struggle for self-determination in a land they see as their God given land.

This resolution is not balanced. At this time the Secretary of State and the Administration are working to bring peace to the Middle East. This resolution does not help this cause. This resolution damages our nation's moral authority and credibility as a fair broker in the Middle East conflict. I cannot support the resolution in its present form.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, while our country continues to be a staunch ally and long-time friend to Israel, this resolution does nothing to bring about a ceasefire that might lead to a lasting peace. Our role should be drawn these bitter enemies closer together, not drive them further apart, as this resolution does.

The legislation, far more than a simple expression of support for Israel, also contains a long list of rhetorical "findings" which undermine any attempts to move the parties toward a comprehensive peace agreement. It will do little but further enflame the conflict in the Middle East.

The measure before the House today comes on the heels of weeks of work by the Bush Administration to reduce tension in the region, and bring about an end to the suicide bombings and Israeli incursion into Palestinian towns. The resolution would likely complicate the President's efforts since it provides a one-sided view of the Israeli/Palestinian conflict that likely would only cause anger and distrust for the U.S. among the Palestinian people and erode the hard-won progress the Administration has already made.

I and other Members have expressed a preference for a more balanced statement that would express support for Israel, but additionally advance the cause of peace. Press reports and a Member on the floor during debate today has stated that officials with the U.S. agency responsible for the peace process efforts, the State Department, also indicated their preference for a less one-sided bill.

Senator JOSEPH LIEBERMAN and Congressman DAVID OBEY both had prepared resolutions of support that were much more balanced than I would have strongly supported had I had the opportunity to do so. Both of those resolutions still condemn suicide bombings, support the right of Israel to defend itself and call on the Palestinians and other Arab states to work to end terrorism. Congressman OBEY's resolution also urges Israel to make it clear when it will withdraw from Palestinian territories.

Additionally, included in the measure before the House today is a statement supporting increased foreign aid to Israel. With budget deficits projected over the next several years, we won't even have the necessary resources to strengthen homeland security, improve Medicare benefits, safeguard Social Security, develop a comprehensive drug plan for senior citizens and provide a high quality education for America's youth.

We must do all we can to support the President's efforts to bring about peace in this region. I certainly do not want to undermine what progress he has already made. While I have consistently been a supporter of the State of Israel, regrettably, today I must vote 'no,' on this resolution. It is always difficult to say "no" to friends, but we must when it's appropriate. And it is appropriate here because this action does not advance the long-term cause of peace in the region.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 392, a Resolution to express solidarity with Israel in its fight against terrorism. Now more than ever, Americans can sympathize and find common cause with the plight of the Israeli people as they struggle against terrorism. And now more than ever, Israel needs our solidarity and support.

It is, and has always been, in both the moral and strategic interests of the United States to

stand by its only true friend and ally in the region. Israel is a lone democracy in a region that knows too little political freedom. It is one of the few countries in that volatile part of the world that does not support terrorist organizations. Like America, Israel is a society governed by law. Like ours, the Israeli press questions the actions of its government and allows for a pluralism of ideas. And like ours, Israel's society is under attack by those that seek its destruction and are willing to use the most inhumane form of terrorism—turning young men and women into human bombs—to achieve their ends.

Like all concerned Americans, I hope for a peaceful, negotiated solution to the crisis in the Middle East, and I condemn intentional acts of violence against all civilians, both Israeli and Palestinian. When a Palestinian leader emerges who will renounce terrorism unequivocally and seek peace, all parties in the region will have an obligation to embrace the opportunity. Until then, Israel has the right to defend itself from those who will never accept its very existence. That's why it is so critical that we here in America never waver in our resolve to stand by the State of Israel.

Israel faces the unfortunate reality of being a beachhead in the global war against terrorism. But more than this, Israel is a friend and ally. If terror is allowed to succeed in Israel, by forcing political concessions with vicious suicide attacks, it will only embolden those who seek to destroy the U.S., and indeed all civilization, with similar tactics. Israel is fighting for its survival against the forces of terror. Terror must not be allowed to win.

The Israeli people will continue their struggle for peace and security. They should do so knowing they have the full support of the United States of America. Good diplomacy is based on sound values. American values stand firmly with the State of Israel.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the resolution.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for this resolution, because I want to leave no doubt whatsoever about the depth of my support for the people of Israel. I grieve with them at the losses they have sustained, and stand in solidarity with them in their hour of peril. At the same time, I want to express my disappointment that the resolution fails to express concern for the loss of life on both sides of this conflict. Our hearts should go out to all innocent victims and their families, whether they be Israeli or Palestinian.

I am also concerned that this resolution may complicate the efforts of the President to bring the parties together. America is the only power on earth that has the means and the will to move the parties toward a comprehensive peace that each can accept. The President and Secretary Powell have committed themselves to this effort. And we should do nothing in this chamber that might make it more difficult for the Administration to exercise its leverage with both sides to bring about this result.

Finally, the resolution says nothing about what is required to achieve a "just, comprehensive and lasting peace". In my view, it requires mutual recognition of an independent, viable Palestinian state and an Israel that exists within secure and defensible borders. It requires that each side recognize the legitimate aspirations of the other—and put an end to the cycle of provocation and retaliation that has brought so much misery to them both.

While only the parties themselves can set the terms for peace, this much is evident. On the Palestinian side there must be an end to terrorist violence and the financial and material support the terrorists receive from Arab states. On the Israeli side, there must be an end to the building of settlements, the bulldozing of neighborhoods, and other provocative acts that have driven the Palestinians to despair.

Decades of conflict have taken a devastating toll on both communities, creating conditions in which the Israelis suffer unimaginable losses and the Palestinians have nothing left to lose. What seems tragically clear is that the violence will continue until both sides recognize that they have more to gain from peace than from continuing their armed struggle. This will take more than resolutions. It will take genuine resolve. The kind of resolve that was so movingly expressed by the late Prime Minister of Israel, Yitzhak Rabin, in his final speech before his tragic assassination on November 4, 1995:

I was a military man for 27 years. I fought as long as there was no chance for peace. I believe that there is now a chance for peace, a great chance. We must take advantage of it for the sake of those standing here, and for those who are not here—and they are many.

I have always believed that the majority of the people want peace and are ready to take risks for peace. In coming here today, you demonstrate, together with many others who did not come, that the people truly desire peace and oppose violence . . . This is a course which is fraught with difficulties and pain. For Israel, there is no path that is without pain. But the path of peace is preferable to the path of war.

Israelis and Palestinians have experienced much pain since Rabin offered those final words to his people. But the risks he believed worth taking are still the only viable option. Only by following the path he laid out can Israel and America keep faith with him and all who have given their lives for the sake of peace.

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, my vote today on H. Res. 392 is not a vote in favor of the Israelis or the Palestinians. Nor is it a vote against them. It is a vote for peace. I am convinced that an enduring settlement on the long-standing differences between Israel and Palestine cannot be achieved through military means—only through negotiations and compromise. The ongoing violence has caused pain and grief beyond measure for both peoples and there is blame and sympathy enough to go around.

The United States can play an important—and irreplaceable—role as an honest broker and a friend to all. Israel has been a good friend and ally to the U.S. I support her right to exist and her right to defend herself. The United States has always had a special relationship with her and I remain committed to that relationship. However, I am also steadfast in my desire to see a two-state peace in the Middle East and I do not believe such a peace is possible without fair, thoughtful leadership by the United States.

For some time now, constituents on both sides of this issue have demanded the same thing—that the U.S. condemn the other side, cut off all funding and diplomatic relations, and marginalize its leader. This does not strike me as wise. Former Senator and peace negotiator George Mitchell was very candid with me in a recent conversation about this. He believes

that we must maintain all manner of influence with both parties and our financial involvement in the region is part of that. I agree. At this point, we should not sever relations with either party or jeopardize future negotiations by being heavy-handed or unfair to either side.

I am uncomfortable with the tone of this resolution. While it is understandable that the House may wish to express grave concerns about the violence currently taking place in the region, those concerns must be expressed in a way that does not cause either party to doubt the United States "bona fides" as a peacemaker nor its commitments to achieving outcomes acceptable to both parties. George Mitchell has been very clear that cease-fire and long term peace will require delicate negotiation of many small steps that will have to be taken—a few at a time—by both parties simultaneously. This resolution does not enhance the probability of such an agreement.

Over the time I've been in Congress, the House has acted several times on resolutions such as this. I have tried to respond thoughtfully and fairly. However, there have been times when I have been concerned about the House's persistent efforts to intrude into the peace process from a distance. In those instances, I have abstained. Diplomacy is a delicate endeavor. There is little room for bias or partisan politics. For House Members to act unilaterally while negotiations are being sought or are ongoing would seem to jeopardize efforts to get both sides to compromise toward an agreement. For the Congress to so clearly take one party's side would seem to undermine, rather than further, our hopes for peace. A resolution such as this seems contrary to the outcome we all profess to desire.

Accordingly, I cast my vote as "present."

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the sentiments of this resolution, but not the timing. Though a well-intentioned document reinforcing the strong friendship between our nation and Israel, this resolution comes before us at an extremely sensitive moment in the Administration's attempts to stop the terrorist violence that has plagued Israel over the last 18 months.

Ever since the 2000 Camp David meetings, where Yasser Arafat rejected former Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak's offer of 98 percent of what Arafat had demanded from Israel, the tensions in the Middle East have escalated. When Arafat left those meetings without a deal, the extremist faction who oppose peace, and, in fact, oppose the existence of Israel itself, got the green light to destabilize the region.

Despite Yasser Arafat's assertion that he opposes terrorism and is a so-called "man of peace," his very own al-Aqsa Martyrs Brigade has been identified by this government as a "Foreign Terrorist Organization." This Brigade has been responsible for the deaths of too many innocent Israeli citizens. Earlier this year, the Karine-A was stopped en route to Arafat's Palestinian Authority carrying 50 tons of offensive weapons from Iran. Clearly, Arafat does not have peace in mind, nor does he view Israel as a neighbor.

Since September 2000, hundreds of innocent people in Israel have been killed by terrorists, sometimes financed and supported by the Palestinian Authority. We have learned that the Palestinian Authority and Saddam Hussein's Iraq are financially rewarding the families of those who willingly sacrifice their

lives to murder innocent people and stop the peace process. We have heard some threaten to use oil as a weapon against the United States unless we stop Israel from defending herself. Mr. Speaker, terrorist actions in our country or Israel or any country should be viewed as an act of war. More importantly, any country threatened by terrorists actions should be able to defend itself. We assert that right, and we should not set a different standard for our allies.

All of that being said, I am concerned about what message we send, as a Congress, at this particular time. The President is moving forward with delicate negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians. Just yesterday, a breakthrough in negotiations yielded the release of Yasser Arafat from his headquarters in Ramallah. This came as a result of both sides trusting our government as a third party negotiator.

At this critical point, we should follow the lead of the Bush Administration, and maintain the trust established on both sides. There are many people in this country who have a kinship with Israel, a trusted ally and the only democracy in the Middle East, and want to see Israel reach peace with its neighbors, after more than 50 years of bloodshed. However, that mission becomes much harder if we are no longer honest brokers, who can be trusted by both sides. When the trust is broken, the Palestinians will look for others to help them, perhaps countries like Iraq or Iran, who will use armies, not diplomats to try and end this conflict.

This Congress will have its chance to make clear its feelings on Israel and her right of self-defense and, ultimately, deal with Mr. Arafat. However, that time should not be now. I will be voting 'present' and stand with the President. There is a time for this vote, it is just not this day.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, but I'd also like to take this opportunity to clarify my support.

I support the resolution's call for our continued solidarity with Israel and for the condemnation of terrorism everywhere and of Palestinian suicide bombings, in particular. I support the resolution's call for the Palestinian Authority to clamp down on terrorism in its territories and for Arab States to declare their opposition to terrorism. I support the resolution's call for the international community to help alleviate the humanitarian needs of the Palestinian people. Most importantly, I support the resolution's urging that all parties in the region pursue efforts to establish a just, lasting, and comprehensive peace. However, I wonder what has prompted the leadership to schedule this resolution for consideration at this moment.

I do not think anyone has any doubt about our country's continuing support for the people of Israel. That has been a fundamental part of American foreign policy for decades, and remains so today. I do not think anyone, at home or abroad, has any doubt about it—so, as far as I can see, this resolution is not needed to remove any doubt. Further, I am concerned that the timing of this resolution could make the Administration's efforts to resolve the current crisis more difficult. I believe the Administration must continue to work with the Saudis and other moderate Arab states to get the parties to agree to move forward with the Mitchell and Tenet plans, and down the line, to restart negotiations.

In addition, I believe that Congress should consider additional assistance for Israel, but that it should also consider emergency humanitarian assistance—provided through NGOs—for Palestinian civilians, whose misery grows and feeds extremism in the region. I believe that Israel must heed President Bush's call to end its recent incursions into West Bank cities and that it must end settlement expansion, recognizing that these actions diminish the possibilities of what this resolution calls for—a "just, lasting, and comprehensive peace."

I believe that with crisis comes opportunity. There is now a window of opportunity to move away from the potential for a regional conflagration. Only the U.S. has been accepted by both parties as one that can lead them to peace. Now is not the time to take any action that might reduce our leverage with the Palestinian or with our Middle East allies. At this critical time, Congress should not only be signaling its strong support for Israel and signaling its rejection of violence, but it should also be trying to help—not hinder—the Administration as it works to get the parties back to the table.

International Relations Committee Chair HENRY HYDE said it best: "I would have preferred a more balanced resolution, because I think we have to get beyond finger-pointing and ask ourselves, will this action help move us toward a cease-fire and a comprehensive peace agreement?" I'm not sure that the answer is yes.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today not to assess blame—because there is too much of it to go around. Nor to offer unqualified support to either side in this conflict—because blind support only deepens the tragic spiral of violence.

I am here today to say once and for all, violence is wrong. Killing in the name of religion only defames it; and forcing the submission from an entire people only spawns hatred, contempt, hopelessness, and more violence.

We are here today to give support to Israel, and they do deserve our support. Israel, like all nations, has a responsibility to ensure the safety of its citizens. Just as our nation needs to protect itself from terror, so must Israel.

This resolution allows this great institution to emot; it is full of emotion, righteous indignation, and colorful language. But as elected officials of the greatest nation in the history of the world we must do more. Emotion is cathartic, but wisdom and pragmatism offer much more.

This resolution was written under the justified anger that follows the terrorist's carnage. And in its emotion we have lost wisdom. We have made no mention of the 1,500 Palestinian civilians who have lost their lives in the recent conflict. Surely, the United States of America and its Congress consider the health of an innocent child to be equally tragic—whether she is Israeli or Palestinian, Jewish, Christian, or Muslim.

Instead of sentiment we should be offering constructive ways to bring about a viable political solution to the current crisis. Remember, when the United States was fully engaged, when the Central Intelligence Agency was forcing the Palestinian Authority and the State of Israel to work together both peoples enjoyed three of the most peaceful years of their history.

I applaud the increasing engagement of this Administration in finding a political settlement.

As a Congress we need to speak as one voice in our support for Secretary of State Powell. The task before him is immense, but it is necessary. If we do not counter the escalating violence with diplomacy we lose the moral legitimacy of our leadership.

The best way to secure the continued existence of the State of Israel is to simultaneously give hope and voice to the aspirations of the Palestinian people. A safe, secure, economically prosperous, and truly democratic Palestinian state is the only way to attain this peace.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for this resolution, and commend Majority Leader TOM DELAY and Representative TOM LANTOS for their work. Israel should know that this House, this President, and the American people support her while she wages a war against terrorists who would mercilessly kill her citizens. Israel is fighting for nothing less than her right to exist, and today we express our solidarity with them in that fight.

I believe that Prime Minister Sharon, along with his united government and the Israeli Defense Forces, is taking the steps necessary to weed out the nest of terrorists that have attacked their citizens for so long. Suicide bombers have no place among people who wish to join the community of nations. Leaders who tolerate their existence should have no welcome and no seat at the table with world leaders. Real peace can only be achieved when the brutality of those who murder innocent men, women and children is halted completely.

I encourage all Members to support this resolution, Israel, the President, and all others including the courageous men and women of our own Armed Forces who are together waging the global war against terrorism.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 392, a resolution expressing solidarity with Israel in its fight against terrorism that was introduced by Congressman TOM DELAY, the distinguished Majority Whip from Texas. Unfortunately, due to a family illness, I was unable to be present when the House voted on H. Res. 392, however, had I been here, I would have voted "Aye."

Is it important for the House of Representatives to support H. Res. 392? You bet it is and let me tell you I believe so. The atrocities committed daily in the Middle East make us all sick and there's not a member in this body that doesn't want to see an end to it. We are confronted daily with scenes of carnage and destruction. Can we understand such violence? Yes we can. The facts, all too often forgotten, reveal the truth as to why peace has eluded the Middle East.

Today, Israel is the only democracy in the region. Israel is smaller than the state of New Hampshire and is surrounded by nations hostile to its existence. When the United Nations proposed the establishment of two states in the region—one Jewish, one Arab, the Jews accepted the proposal and declared their independence in 1948. The Arab states rejected the UN plan. In 1948, five Arab armies invaded Israel. Again, in 1967, Arab armies amassed on Israel's borders with the clear intention to invade the state. Rather than suffer a bloody ambush, Israel rightfully took the necessary steps to defend its citizens and homeland, a right obliged to every Nation. It

was during the Six Day War of 1967 that the West Bank and Gaza came under Israeli control.

Israel has returned most of the land it captured during the 1967 war, and right after the war offered to return all of it in exchange for peace and normal relations. Unfortunately, the offer was rejected—another missed opportunity for peace in the Middle East. As a result of the 1978 Camp David accords—in which Egypt recognized the right of Israel to exist and normal relations were established between the two countries—Israel returned the Sinai desert, a territory three times the size of Israel and 91 percent of the territory Israel took control of in the 1967 war.

Israel has conceded that the Palestinians have legitimate claims to the disputed territories and is willing to engage in negotiations on the matter, and in return they only ask that they be allowed to live in peace. Seventy-three percent of Israelis agree to a Palestinian state that will live peacefully alongside Israel.

In 2000, a Palestinian state in the West Bank and Gaza was offered to the Palestinians at Camp David, by Israel and the U.S., in return for peace. The U.S. said yes, Europe said yes, the U.N. said yes, and the Arab countries said yes. Why didn't it happen? Arafat said No. Chairman Arafat and the other Palestinian leaders said no because they demand a Palestinian state in place of Israel, not alongside of it.

Instead, the Palestinian Authority sanctioned an intifada, which the world is witnessing today. This has included twenty months of terror, shooting, and the bombing of innocent civilians.

Simply describing the situation as a "cycle of violence," although it may be accurate, ignores the distinctions in tactics and motivations of the two sides. Palestinian militants kill Israeli civilians, using bombs detonated by teenage suicide bombers who are promised wealth and pleasure for their martyrdom. Israeli troops kill Palestinians in self-defense of their lives and that of their countrymen.

The list of disturbing facts about Palestinian terror is long. Israeli troops recently discovered large quantities of counterfeit Israeli currency in the basement of Chairman Arafat's Ramallah headquarters, along with the printing machines that made it. They also found an invoice for \$8,500 to cover bombing supplies in the office of Arafat's chief financial officer—it was on the letterhead of the Al Aqsa Martyrs Brigade, an offshoot of Arafat's Fatah Party. The invoice specifically requested \$150 to build each bomb, saying the group would need five to nine bombs per week.

The Al Aqsa Brigades, which are forces directly under Chairman Arafat's control, have been designated as a Foreign Terrorist Organization by our government. Indeed, Yasser Arafat wears the map of the entire area of Israel on his uniform.

Mr. Speaker, the national Palestinian goal is Jihad. All Palestinian organizations—political, military, cultural and commercial, along with the whole Palestinian school system, advocate the annihilation of Israel and educate generations of school-age children to become terrorists.

Furthermore, Palestinians who have voiced an objection to the practice of blowing up innocent Israeli civilians are labeled traitors.

In July 2001, these are the words of Chairman Yasser Arafat himself addressing his

people at a public event, "Kill a settler every day. Shoot at settlers everywhere. Do not pay attention to what I say to the media, the television or public appearances. Pay attention only to the written instructions that you receive from me."

The Palestinian terror attacks are not spontaneous acts of desperation. They are the product of a deliberate, well-planned, state-sponsored education and incitement program. Its product is to turn a whole people into a nation of terrorists. Since the Oslo Accords in 1993, when the Palestinian Authority gained control over 98% of the Palestinian population, it has been hard at work building this kind of terror system.

A fair and balanced portrayal of the current Middle East situation reveals that one nation stands head and shoulders above the other in its commitment to human right and democracy, as well as in its commitment to peace and mutual security. Mr. Speaker, that nation is Israel. That's why H. Res. 392 is so important. I, for one, don't want the greatest nation on earth, the United States, to weaken our resolve in the all-important fight against terrorism. Nor should we ask it of our only true friend and ally in the Middle East region, and that is clearly Israel.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, this legislation could not have come at a worse time in the ongoing Middle East crisis. Just when we have seen some positive signs that the two sides may return to negotiations toward a peaceful settlement, Congress has jumped into the fray on one side of the conflict. I do not believe that this body wishes to de-rail the slight progress that seems to have come from the Administration's more even-handed approach over the past several days. So why is it that we are here today ready to pass legislation that clearly and openly favors one side in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict?

There are many troubling aspects to this legislation. The legislation says that "the number of Israelis killed during that time [since September 2000] by suicide terrorist attacks alone, on a basis proportional to the United States population, is approximately 9,000, three times the number killed in the terrorist attacks on New York and Washington on September 11, 2001." This kind of numbers game with the innocent dead strikes me as terribly disrespectful and completely unethical.

It is, when speaking of the dead, the one-sidedness of this bill that is so unfortunate. How is it that the side that loses seven people to every one on the other side is portrayed as the sole aggressor and condemned as terrorist? This is only made worse by the fact that Palestinian deaths are seen in the Arab world as being American-inspired, as it is our weapons that are being used against them. This bill just reinforces negative perceptions of the United States in that part of the world. What might be the consequences of this? I think we need to stop and think about that for a while. We in this body have a Constitutional responsibility to protect the national security of the United States. This one-sided intervention in a far-off war has the potential to do great harm to our national security.

Perhaps this is why the Administration views this legislation as "not a very helpful approach" to the situation in the Middle East. In my view, it is bad enough that we are intervening at all in this conflict, but this legislation strips any lingering notion that the United

States intends to be an honest broker. It states clearly that the leadership of one side—the Palestinians—is bad and supports terrorism just at a time when this Administration negotiates with both sides in an attempt to bring peace to the region. Talk about undermining the difficult efforts of the president and the State Department. What incentive does Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat or his organization have to return to the negotiating table if we as “honest broker” make it clear that in Congress’s eyes, the Palestinians are illegitimate terrorists? Must we become so involved in this far-off conflict that we are forced to choose between Arafat and Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon? The United States Congress should not, Constitutionally, be in the business of choosing who gets to lead which foreign people.

Many people of various religious backgrounds seem determined to portray what is happening in the Middle East as some kind of historic/religious struggle, where one side is pre-ordained to triumph and destroy the other. Even some in this body have embraced this notion. Surely the religious component that some interject into the conflict rouses emotions and adds fuel to the fire. But this is dangerous thinking. Far from a great holy war, the Middle East conflict is largely about what most wars are about: a struggle for land and resources in a part of the world where both are scarce. We must think and act rationally, with this fact clearly in mind.

Just as with other interventionism in other similar struggles around the world, our meddling in the Middle East has unforeseen consequences. Our favoritism of one side has led to the hatred of America and Americans by the other side. We are placing our country in harm’s way with this approach. It is time to step back and look at our policy in the Middle East. After 24 years of the “peace process” and some 300 million of our dollars, we are no closer to peace than when President Carter concluded the Camp David talks.

Mr. Speaker, any other policy that had so utterly failed over such a long period of time would likely come under close scrutiny here. Why is it that when it comes to interventionism in the Middle East conflict we continue down this unproductive and very expensive road?

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the resolution.

This resolution expresses the solidarity of the Congress and the American people with Israel in its struggle against the forces of hatred and violence. It is both fitting and appropriate for us today to declare our support at a time when Israel has been subjected to repeated acts of terror. When 125 people in a small country die in one month, when a 17-year old girl cannot make a simple trip to the grocery store without fear of being blown up, or when 28 Jews at prayer during a Passover Seder are killed in cold blood by a suicide bomber, it is time for us to speak out and speak up.

Israel is our most reliable friend in the Middle East. It is the only democracy, a beacon of hope, in a region of the world where the freedoms we all take for granted—freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of religion, freedom to challenge your government non-violently without fear of retribution—simply do not exist. Israel is the only country in the Middle East that guarantees all these freedoms.

Israel, like the United States and every other country, has a right and obligation to de-

fend its citizens when under attack. One of the reasons I have always been so supportive of Israel is that even when it acts to defend itself, it also continues to reach out its hand in peace to its neighbors.

This is a country, who against all odds, made peace with Egypt. It made peace with Jordan. It withdrew its forces voluntarily from Lebanon. And a year and a half ago, under the guidance of President Clinton, this same country offered a historic peace proposal to the Palestinians that many thought was too risky. Unfortunately, peace was rejected by Chairman Arafat and he chose to return to a path of violence and terror.

The Congress stands here today to condemn and reject this path of violence led by the Palestinian leader. Instead, we must return to the path of peace. Israel must have a partner who is willing to say “no” to those who would use terror and violence. Chairman Arafat must take action against those Palestinians who would block the path to peace. There is no other choice. The time has come for Yasir Arafat to make a decision: will he write a page of history by pursuing the path to peace or will he be a mere footnote for leaving behind a trail of terror.

Today we stand by Israel but we also stand for peace. As my friend and mentor, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. observed just before his death: “I see Israel, and never mind saying it, as one of the great outposts of democracy in the world and a marvelous example of what can be done, how desert land almost can be transformed into an oasis of brotherhood and democracy. Peace for Israel means security and that security must be a reality.”

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I supported H. Res. 392, however I would have favored a more balanced resolution. As one of 435 members of Congress and one who does not serve on the International Relations Committee, I offered my views beforehand by respectfully suggesting that my colleagues incorporate into their views portions of a similar measure put forward by my colleague from Oregon, Representative PETER DEFAZIO, H. Res. 394. While I do not agree with every provision of Mr. DEFAZIO’s resolution, I think each one of us can agree this Congress should:

Unequivocally condemn acts of violence against Israeli and Palestinian civilians, urge all parties to recognize that continued military attacks and terrorist activities will only lead to escalating violence and the potential destabilization of the Middle East and neighboring regions, and urge all parties to stop using state-controlled media to incite hatred and violence.

These are reasonable provisions, and should have been included in the text of H. Res. 392.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote “yes” on H. Res. 392. Although I have grave concerns that passing this resolution will further inflame tensions in the Middle East, I am voting for the resolution in part to dispel any notion that I am anti-Israel or that I am not sensitive to Israel’s right to self-defense. I strongly support Israel, but I also strongly support efforts to bring about peace in the region, which will allow the Israeli and Palestinian people to live together side by side without having to endure an endless cycle of violence. In the past, the House has passed similar resolutions that I believe have been counterproductive to the peace

process. I fear that we are doing that again. Our own Secretary of State and National Security Advisor have expressed reservations with moving forward with this resolution because of the delicacy of the situation in the Middle East. I agree with them. We should not be bringing up this resolution at this time. That is why I intend to vote “no” on the rule governing debate over H. Res. 392.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I stand today in support of House Resolution 392, in which we express America’s solidarity with Israel in its fight against terrorism. The truth is, the United States and Israel are engaged in a common struggle against terrorism. It is a war that neither nation sought; it is a war that both nations must win.

The resolution also calls upon the Palestinian leader, Yasir Arafat, to choose peace and to fulfill his commitment to dismantle the terrorist infrastructure that threatens the Israeli people. If we had a dollar for every time a U.S. official had sent this message to Mr. Arafat we would be able to fully fund the war on terrorism. It is my prayer, for the sake of Israel and all the Palestinian people who would like nothing more than to live in peace, that Mr. Arafat finally honors the pledge to peace that he has repeatedly made. The recent Israeli incursions into the West Bank have occurred only because Mr. Arafat has not lived up to his responsibilities. This resolution we are considering today places the obligations to ending terrorism where it belongs—on the shoulders of Mr. Arafat.

All reasonable people begin their discussions of the violence that shatters the Middle East from the same position—it is horrible and many people on both sides have suffered greatly. The question revolves around how it can be resolved so that the people of the region can live in peace and build a secure future based on democratic principles. The burden has always been placed on Israel to do something for peace. For example, it has often been said that if Israel would simply move back to its pre-1967 borders there would be peace. But history shows there were wars against Israel in 1948, 1956 and 1967—and during that time Israel was within the borders that we are today told hold the key to peace. Absent a clear, forceful and enduring commitment on the part of Mr. Arafat to end terrorism there is no reason to believe those borders would produce peace today anymore than they did in the past.

All this being said, I am not convinced that today’s resolution will have much of an effect on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. In fact, it may bring other members in this body to this very House floor with resolutions in support of Mr. Arafat. That is their right. However, America must speak with one single voice and that voice should belong to the president, not members of Congress. It is my hope that we can stop the resolutions and allow the administration to work toward establishing an atmosphere in which Israel and the Palestinians can begin learning how to live side by side in a land where they both have long-standing interests.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Israel, its people, and its future as a vibrant and stable democracy. I also rise in support of the Palestinian people and their rights to a homeland and to live in peace and security with their Israeli neighbors. I rise in support of a future for the Middle East

in which children—Israeli and Palestinian alike—no longer have to go to school in armored busses and no longer have to worry about the safety of their mothers and fathers.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give my support to a peace process that benefits from the full engagement of the United States and is possessed of a fair and balanced approach to the problem. I rise to support a plan that understands the concerns of both sides and works to ensure that all voices in the region are heard and understood. I rise in support of the idea that peace in the Middle East is achievable and that two peoples brought together by history and geography can put their differences aside in the interests of future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the notion that the United States can and must serve as the indispensable nation in the Middle East. Only the United States is prepared and equipped to serve as the impartial negotiator that is so desperately needed in the region, and I hope that our engagement in the current crisis will increase in intensity and focus. The current Administration has made a good start in this regard, but they can and should do more.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today, finally, in support of the goals contained in United Nations Security Council Resolution 242, which calls for the "termination of all claims or states of belligerency and respect for an acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force." I urge all parties in the region to vigorously pursue efforts to establish a just, lasting, and comprehensive peace in the Middle East that will enable Israel and an independent Palestinian state to exist within the context of full and normal relations.

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for House Resolution 392 and my solidarity with the people of the Republic of Israel as they battle against terrorism. I also rise to thank Mr. DELAY for introducing this resolution, and the 52 members from both sides of the aisle that joined me in co-sponsoring this bill.

Since September 11 the United States and Israel have been linked in the same battle, and have fought the same foe. The same forces of evil that struck New York and Washington have struck Israel almost every day for the last 2 years. The same people who wish to drive Israel into the sea wish to drive America from the Middle East.

Some people wish to draw a line between the United States and Israel, and separate our causes. Nothing could be more misguided. Israel and the United States are democracies, and our unfree opponents envy us. Our religious freedom offends them, for they are free only to worship at the state's behest. Our two nation's freely trade with the world, and become wealthy, while they see the wealth of their lands stolen by their own corrupt leaders. And, in this crisis, we are strong and confident, while they know their cause is marching to what Ronald Reagan rightly called "The dustbin of history". I urge my colleagues to join with me in standing with Israel and supporting this resolution.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the pending resolution of which I am an original co-sponsor, H. Res. 392, ex-

pressing solidarity with Israel in its fight against terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, Israel and the United States are now engaged in a common struggle against terrorism both at home and abroad. The United States must stand strongly with Israel during this most trying of times. Since 2000 Israel has witnessed a horrendous level of terrorist activity directed at the civilian population, with scores of Israelis killed by suicide bombers and attacks and hundreds injured. While I recognize that many Palestinians have also been killed or injured in this conflict, only the Palestinians are engaging a systematic and deliberate campaign of terror aimed at inflicting as many casualties as possible on the civilian Israeli population.

This ongoing terror campaign is taking a devastating toll on youth and families. It is clear that such terrorist activities are perpetrated by forces under Yasir Arafat's partial or complete control, such as the al-Aqsa Martyrs Brigades, which is part of Arafat's Fatah organization and has been designated as a Foreign Terrorist Organization by the United States government. Yasir Arafat and his advisers were also involved in the Palestinian Authority's thwarted attempt to obtain 50 tons of offensive weapons shipped from Iran in the Karine-A. The Palestinian Authority, in addition to other Arab governments in the region, continues to provide crucial financial support for terrorist acts, such as providing "martyr" payments to families of suicide bombers.

Yasir Arafat and members of the Palestinian leadership have failed to abide by their commitments to non-violence made in the Israel-PLO Declaration of Principles (Oslo accord) of September 1993, including their pledges: (1) To adhere strictly to "a peaceful resolution of the conflict," (2) to resolve "all outstanding issues relating to permanent status through negotiations," (3) to renounce "the use of terrorism and other acts of violence," and (4) to "assume responsibility over all PLO elements and personnel in order to assure their compliance [with the commitment to non-violence], prevent violence, and discipline violators." In my view the continued terrorism and incitement committed, supported, and coordinated by official arms of the Palestinian Authority are a direct violation of these commitments.

Israel's military operations are an effort to defend it against ongoing terrorist activities. Israel has both a legal right of self-defense and a moral obligation to protect its citizens. The military operations are aimed at dismantling the terrorist infrastructure in the Palestinian areas, an obligation Arafat himself undertook but failed to carry out.

I am outraged at the ongoing Palestinian terrorist campaign, and I have joined with other members of Congress in introducing a resolution that insists that the Palestinian Authority take all necessary steps to end it. Specifically, I call upon the Palestinian Authority to: (1) renounce unequivocally, publicly, and in Arabic all forms of terrorism and violence; (2) destroy the infrastructure of Palestinian terrorist groups; (3) pursue and arrest terrorists whose incarceration has been called for by Israel; (4) either prosecute such terrorists, provide convicted terrorists with the stiffest possible punishment, and ensure that those convicted remain in custody for the full duration of their sentences; or render all arrested terrorists to the Government of Israel for prosecution.

Chairman Arafat has already been put on notice that he must bring an end to these terrorists attacks against innocent Israeli civilians. The United States must make clear that terrorism and violence can never be used as a negotiating tactic. Israel must not make concessions to the Palestinians as a result of the latest terrorist attacks. And the historic and enduring relationship between the United States and Israel will only grow stronger in these times of great turmoil.

Unless PA Chairman Arafat stops the violence and cracks down on terrorist cells under his control and authority, the President should seriously consider the suspension of all diplomatic relations with the Palestinian Authority. I have also co-sponsored H.R. 1795, the Middle East Peace Commitments Act, which would require the imposition of sanctions on the PA if Chairman Arafat fails to comply with the many commitments he has made in the past to stop terrorist activities that are planned or carried out in areas under the PA's control.

I also encourage President Bush to insist that all countries harboring, materially supporting, or acquiescing in the private support of Palestinian terrorist groups end all such support, dismantle the infrastructure of such groups, and bring all terrorists within their borders to justice. I commend the President for his strong leadership against international terrorism, his forthright response to this most recent outrage, and his swift action to freeze additional sources of terrorist funds. As the President stated to a joint session of Congress on September 2001: "from this day forward, any nation that continues to harbor or support terrorism will be regarded by the United States as a hostile regime."

Mr. Speaker, each of us prays for peace in the Middle East, which will lead to the creation of a Palestinian state living in peace and prosperity alongside a safe and secure Israel. The only way to achieve peace is for the Palestinian leaders to not only condemn but to take steps to stop terrorism and violence.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in solidarity with Israel. I'm proud to make this statement of support today, especially in light of the ever-changing news reports coming out of the region.

The resolution currently on the House floor is simple: the United States supports Israel's war against terrorism. Some in the international community contend the United States is biased; they render our country's support for Israel controversial. They are entitled to their opinions, as are we; I firmly believe every American makes the right decision when stating support for Israel during this turbulent time in history.

Israel, our sole democratic ally in the Middle East, continues to persevere. She has faced many tough times since her declaration of Independence, and this threat to Israel's existence surely rates as one of her most difficult battles yet.

Israel fights hatred on a daily basis. This hatred is terrorism. It is murder. Israel has every right to defend herself against terrorism. When innocent civilians are murdered, over and over again, Israel has no choice but to take action.

Israel is no stranger to difficulty, and no stranger to compromise. I continue to support Israel's decision to root out terrorists. I think it's natural, and expected, and it must be done just like America's efforts in Afghanistan. I also support Israel's recent decision to end the situation in Ramallah; the compromise was a

worthwhile trade-off, consistent with Israel's aim: the obliteration of terrorism by getting terrorists off the streets.

Israel faces daily barages of criticism from her Arab neighbors and much of Western Europe, not to mention the United Nations. Sometimes she even faces criticism from United States officials. Nevertheless, Israel continues to act in the best interest of her people.

She refused to end military incursions until Israel's security was assured. After unsubstantiated Palestinian allegations of a massacre in Jenin were publicized by the media, Israel agreed to allow a UN factfinding mission entrance after certain conditions were met. These guidelines were not followed, and Israel revoked its support for a mission; coincidentally, no evidence of a massacre ever materialized, and the UN ended its effort as well.

I firmly believe that difficult decisions will be made in order to achieve a permanent peace, and the above decisions are part of this process. This resolution is evidence that as Israel fights terrorism and searches for a lasting solution to this ongoing crisis, the United States will remain at her side.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 328, nays 82, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 124]

YEAS—328

Ackerman	Bonilla	Cox
Aderholt	Bono	Coyne
Akin	Boozman	Cramer
Andrews	Borski	Crenshaw
Armey	Boswell	Crowley
Baca	Boyd	Cubin
Bachus	Brady (PA)	Culberson
Baird	Brady (TX)	Cummings
Baker	Brown (SC)	Cunningham
Baldacci	Bryant	Davis (CA)
Ballenger	Burr	Davis (FL)
Barcia	Buyer	Davis (IL)
Barr	Calvert	Davis, Jo Ann
Barrett	Camp	Davis, Tom
Bartlett	Cantor	Deal
Barton	Capito	DeLauro
Bass	Cardin	DeLay
Bentsen	Carson (IN)	DeMint
Berkley	Carson (OK)	Deutsch
Berman	Castle	Diaz-Balart
Berry	Chabot	Dicks
Biggert	Chambliss	Dooley
Bishop	Clement	Doolittle
Blagojevich	Coble	Doyle
Blunt	Collins	Dreier
Boehlert	Combest	Duncan
Boehner	Costello	Dunn

Edwards	LaFalce	Rogers (KY)
Ehlers	LaHood	Rogers (MI)
Ehrlich	Lampson	Rohrabacher
Emerson	Langevin	Ross
Engel	Lantos	Rothman
English	Larsen (WA)	Royce
Etheridge	Larson (CT)	Ryan (WI)
Evans	Latham	Ryun (KS)
Ferguson	LaTourette	Sandlin
Flake	Leach	Saxton
Fletcher	Levin	Schaffer
Foley	Lewis (CA)	Schakowsky
Forbes	Lewis (GA)	Schiff
Ford	Lewis (KY)	Schrock
Fossella	Linder	Scott
Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo	Sensenbrenner
Frost	Lowey	Sessions
Gallegly	Lucas (KY)	Shadegg
Ganske	Lucas (OK)	Shaw
Gekas	Luther	Shays
Gephardt	Lynch	Sherman
Gibbons	Maloney (CT)	Sherwood
Gilchrest	Maloney (NY)	Shimkus
Gillmor	Manzullo	Shows
Gilman	Markey	Shuster
Gonzalez	Mascara	Simmons
Goode	Matsui	Simpson
Goodlatte	McCarthy (NY)	Skeen
Gordon	McCollum	Skelton
Goss	McCrery	Slaughter
Graham	McInnis	Smith (MI)
Granger	McIntyre	Smith (NJ)
Graves	McKeon	Smith (TX)
Green (TX)	McNulty	Smith (WA)
Greenwood	Meehan	Souder
Grucchi	Meek (FL)	Stearns
Gutierrez	Meeks (NY)	Stenholm
Gutknecht	Menendez	Strickland
Hall (TX)	Mica	Stump
Hansen	Miller, Dan	Stupak
Harman	Miller, Gary	Sununu
Hart	Miller, Jeff	Sweeney
Hastings (FL)	Moore	Tancredo
Hastings (WA)	Moran (KS)	Tanner
Hayes	Morella	Tauscher
Hayworth	Myrick	Tauzin
Hefley	Nadler	Taylor (NC)
Herger	Napolitano	Terry
Hill	Neal	Thomas
Hilleary	Nethercutt	Thornberry
Hinojosa	Ney	Thune
Hobson	Northup	Thurman
Hoeffel	Norwood	Tiahrt
Holden	Nussle	Tiberi
Holt	Ortiz	Toomey
Hooley	Osborne	Towns
Horn	Ose	Turner
Hostettler	Otter	Udall (NM)
Houghton	Owens	Upton
Hoyer	Oxley	Velazquez
Hulshof	Pallone	Visclosky
Hunter	Paul	Vitter
Hyde	Pelosi	Walden
Isakson	Pence	Walsh
Israel	Peterson (PA)	Watkins (OK)
Issa	Phelps	Watson (CA)
Jackson-Lee	Pickering	Watts (OK)
(TX)	Pitts	Waxman
Johnson (CT)	Platts	Weiner
Johnson (IL)	Pombo	Weldon (FL)
Johnson, Sam	Portman	Weldon (PA)
Jones (NC)	Pryce (OH)	Weller
Kanjorski	Putnam	Wexler
Keller	Quinn	Whitfield
Kelly	Radanovich	Wicker
Kennedy (MN)	Ramstad	Wilson (NM)
Kennedy (RI)	Rangel	Wilson (SC)
Kerns	Regula	Wolf
King (NY)	Rehberg	Wu
Kingston	Reyes	Wynn
Kirk	Reynolds	Young (AK)
Knollenberg	Rodriguez	Young (FL)
Kolbe	Roemer	

NAYS—82

Abercrombie	Condit	Hinchey
Allen	Conyers	Honda
Baldwin	DeFazio	Inslee
Becerra	DeGette	Jackson (IL)
Bereuter	Delahunt	Johnson, E. B.
Blumenauer	Dingell	Jones (OH)
Boniior	Doggett	Kaptur
Boucher	Eshoo	Kildee
Brown (OH)	Farr	Kilpatrick
Capps	Filner	Kind (WI)
Capuano	Frank	Kleczka
Clay	Green (WI)	Kucinich
Clayton	Hall (OH)	Lee
Clyburn	Hilliard	Lipinski

Lofgren	Pastor	Serrano
Matheson	Payne	Snyder
McCarthy (MO)	Peterson (MN)	Solis
McDermott	Petri	Spratt
McGovern	Pomeroy	Stark
McKinney	Price (NC)	Taylor (MS)
Miller, George	Rahall	Thompson (CA)
Mink	Rivers	Tierney
Mollohan	Roybal-Allard	Udall (CO)
Moran (VA)	Rush	Waters
Oberstar	Sabo	Watt (NC)
Obey	Sanchez	Woolsey
Olver	Sanders	
Pascarell	Sawyer	

NOT VOTING—24

Bilirakis	Hoekstra	Riley
Brown (FL)	Istook	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton	Jefferson	Roukema
Callahan	Jenkins	Sullivan
Cannon	John	Thompson (MS)
Cooksey	McHugh	Traffant
Crane	Millender-	Wamp
Everett	McDonald	
Fattah	Murtha	

□ 1450

Ms. SANCHEZ, Mrs. CAPPS, and Messrs. BECERRA, BLUMENAUER, ALLEN, GREEN of Wisconsin, PASCRELL, RUSH and SERRANO changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. PELOSI and Mr. MCINNIS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 329, noes 76, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 125]

AYES—329

Ackerman	Brady (PA)	Davis, Jo Ann
Aderholt	Brady (TX)	Davis, Tom
Akin	Brown (SC)	Deal
Allen	Bryant	DeLauro
Andrews	Burr	DeLay
Armey	Buyer	DeMint
Baca	Calvert	Deutsch
Bachus	Camp	Diaz-Balart
Baird	Cantor	Dicks
Baker	Capito	Doolittle
Baldacci	Capps	Doyle
Ballenger	Cardin	Dreier
Barcia	Carson (IN)	Duncan
Barr	Carson (OK)	Dunn
Bartlett	Castle	Edwards
Barton	Chabot	Ehlers
Bass	Chambliss	Ehrlich
Bentsen	Clement	Emerson
Berkley	Coble	Engel
Berman	Collins	English
Berry	Combest	Etheridge
Biggert	Cox	Evans
Bishop	Coyne	Ferguson
Blagojevich	Cramer	Flake
Blunt	Crenshaw	Fletcher
Boehlert	Crowley	Foley
Boehner	Cubin	Forbes
Bonilla	Culberson	Ford
Bono	Cummings	Fossella
Boozman	Cunningham	Frelinghuysen
Borski	Davis (CA)	Frost
Boswell	Davis (FL)	Gallegly
Boyd	Davis (IL)	Ganske

Gekas	LoBiondo	Royce	Rush	Solis	Udall (CO)
Gephardt	Lowey	Ryan (WI)	Sabo	Stark	Waters
Gibbons	Lucas (KY)	Ryun (KS)	Sanders	Stenholm	Watt (NC)
Gilchrest	Lucas (OK)	Sanchez	Sawyer	Taylor (MS)	Woolsey
Gillmor	Luther	Sandlin	Serrano	Thompson (CA)	
Gilman	Maloney (CT)	Saxton	Snyder	Tierney	
Gonzalez	Maloney (NY)	Schaffer			
Goode	Manzullo	Schakowsky			
Goodlatte	Markey	Schiff			
Gordon	Mascara	Schrock			
Goss	Matheson	Scott			
Graham	Matsui	Sensenbrenner			
Granger	McCarthy (MO)	Sessions			
Graves	McCarthy (NY)	Shadegg			
Green (TX)	McCollum	Shaw			
Green (WI)	McCrery	Shays			
Greenwood	McGovern	Sherman			
Grucci	McInnis	Sherwood			
Gutierrez	McIntyre	Shimkus			
Gutknecht	McKeon	Shows			
Hall (TX)	McNulty	Shuster			
Hansen	Meehan	Simmons			
Harman	Meek (FL)	Simpson			
Hart	Meeks (NY)	Skeen			
Hastings (FL)	Menendez	Skelton			
Hastings (WA)	Mica	Slaughter			
Hayes	Miller, Dan	Smith (MI)			
Hayworth	Miller, Gary	Smith (NJ)			
Hefley	Miller, Jeff	Smith (TX)			
Herger	Moore	Smith (WA)			
Hill	Moran (KS)	Souder			
Hilleary	Morella	Spratt			
Hinojosa	Myrick	Stearns			
Hobson	Nadler	Strickland			
Hoefl	Napolitano	Stump			
Holden	Neal	Stupak			
Hooley	Nethercutt	Sununu			
Horn	Ney	Sweeney			
Hostettler	Northup	Tancred			
Houghton	Nussle	Tanner			
Hoyer	Ortiz	Tauscher			
Hulshof	Osborne	Tauzin			
Hunter	Ose	Taylor (NC)			
Hyde	Otter	Terry			
Isakson	Owens	Thomas			
Israel	Oxley	Thornberry			
Jackson-Lee	Pallone	Thune			
(TX)	Pascrell	Thurman			
Johnson (CT)	Pastor	Tiahrt			
Johnson (IL)	Paul	Tiberi			
Johnson, Sam	Pelosi	Toomey			
Jones (NC)	Pence	Towns			
Kanjorski	Peterson (PA)	Turner			
Keller	Phelps	Udall (NM)			
Kelly	Pickering	Upton			
Kennedy (MN)	Pitts	Velazquez			
Kennedy (RI)	Platts	Visclosky			
Kerns	Pombo	Vitter			
King (NY)	Pomeroy	Walden			
Kingston	Portman	Walsh			
Kirk	Pryce (OH)	Watkins (OK)			
Knollenberg	Putnam	Watson (CA)			
Kolbe	Quinn	Watts (OK)			
LaFalce	Radanovich	Waxman			
LaHood	Ramstad	Weiner			
Lampson	Rangel	Weldon (FL)			
Langevin	Regula	Weldon (PA)			
Lantos	Rehberg	Weller			
Larsen (WA)	Reyes	Wexler			
Larson (CT)	Reynolds	Whitfield			
Latham	Rodriguez	Wicker			
LaTourette	Roemer	Wilson (NM)			
Leach	Rogers (KY)	Wilson (SC)			
Levin	Rogers (MI)	Wolf			
Lewis (CA)	Rohrabacher	Wu			
Lewis (GA)	Ross	Wynn			
Lewis (KY)	Rothman	Young (AK)			

NOES—76

Abercrombie	Doggett	Lee
Baldwin	Eshoo	Lipinski
Barrett	Farr	Loftgren
Becerra	Filner	Lynch
Bereuter	Frank	McDermott
Blumenauer	Hall (OH)	McKinney
Bonior	Hilliard	Miller, George
Boucher	Hinchey	Mink
Brown (OH)	Holt	Mollohan
Capuano	Honda	Moran (VA)
Clay	Inslee	Oberstar
Clayton	Jackson (IL)	Obey
Clyburn	Johnson, E. B.	Olver
Condit	Jones (OH)	Payne
Conyers	Kaptur	Peterson (MN)
Costello	Kildee	Petri
DeFazio	Kilpatrick	Price (NC)
DeGette	Kind (WI)	Rahall
Delahunt	Kleczka	Rivers
Dingell	Kucinich	Roybal-Allard

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 392

Whereas the United States and Israel are now engaged in a common struggle against terrorism and are on the front-lines of a conflict thrust upon them against their will;

Whereas hundreds of innocent Israelis and Palestinians have died tragically in violence since September 2000;

Whereas Palestinian organizations are engaging in an organized, systematic, and deliberate campaign of terror aimed at inflicting as many casualties as possible on the Israeli population, including through the use of suicide terrorist attacks;

Whereas the number of Israelis killed during that time by suicide terrorist attacks alone, on a basis proportional to the United States population, is approximately 9,000, three times the number killed in the terrorist attacks on New York and Washington on September 11, 2001;

Whereas Yasir Arafat and members of the Palestinian leadership have failed to abide by their commitments to non-violence made in the Israel-PLO Declaration of Principles (the "Oslo accord") of September 1993, including their pledges (1) to adhere strictly to "a peaceful resolution of the conflict," (2) to resolve "all outstanding issues relating to permanent status through negotiations," (3) to renounce "the use of terrorism and other acts of violence," and (4) to "assume responsibility over all PLO elements and personnel in order to assure their compliance [with the commitment to nonviolence], prevent violence, and discipline violators";

Whereas the continued terrorism and incitement committed and supported by official arms of the Palestinian Authority are a direct violation of these commitments;

Whereas the al-Aqsa Martyrs Brigades, which is part of Arafat's Fatah organization and has been designated a "Foreign Terrorist Organization" by the United States Government, and other Fatah forces have murdered scores of innocent Israelis;

Whereas forces under Yasir Arafat's direct control were involved in the Palestinian Authority's thwarted attempt to obtain 50 tons of offensive weapons shipped from Iran in the Karine-A, and effort that irrefutably proved Arafat's embrace of the use and escalation of violence;

Whereas the Israeli Government has documents found in the offices of the Palestinian Authority that demonstrate the crucial financial support the Palestinian Authority continues to provide for terrorist acts, including suicide bombers;

Whereas the recent escalation of Palestinian attacks, killing 46 Israelis during the week of Passover, included a heinous suicide bombing at a religious ceremony which killed 27 and wounded more than a hundred, many critically, and was perpetrated by a known terrorist whom Israel had previously asked Yasir Arafat to arrest;

Whereas this suicide attack occurred at the very time United States envoy General Anthony Zinni was attempting to negotiate a cease-fire that would lead to the resumption of Israeli-Palestinians political negotiations;

Whereas, just before the Passover attack, Israel had agreed to General Zinni's cease-fire proposals, whereas Yasir Arafat rejected them;

Whereas Yasir Arafat continues to incite terror by, for example, saying of the Passover suicide bomber, "Oh, God, give me a martyrdom like this";

Whereas Yasir Arafat and the PLO have a long history of making and breaking anti-terrorism pledges;

Whereas President George W. Bush declared at a joint session of Congress on September 20, 2001, that "[f]rom this day forward, any nation that continues to harbor or

NOT VOTING—29

Bilirakis	Hoekstra	Murtha
Brown (FL)	Issa	Norwood
Burton	Istook	Riley
Callahan	Jefferson	Ros-Lehtinen
Cannon	Jenkins	Roukema
Cooksey	John	Sullivan
Crane	Linder	Thompson (MS)
Dooley	McHugh	Trafigant
Everett	Millender-	Wamp
Fattah	McDonald	Young (FL)

□ 1500

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1500

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES REGARDING AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR H.R. 4546, THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, today a "Dear Colleague" letter will be sent to Members informing them that the Committee on Rules is planning to meet next week to grant a rule which may limit the amendment process for H.R. 4546, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003. The bill was ordered reported by the Committee on Armed Services yesterday and is expected to be filed tomorrow.

Any Member who wishes to offer an amendment to this bill should submit 55 copies of the amendment and one copy of a brief explanation of the amendment by 5 p.m. on Tuesday, May 7, to the Committee on Rules in room H-312 in the Capitol.

Amendments should be drafted to the text of the bill as reported by the House Committee on Armed Services, which is expected to be available on Friday, May 3, tomorrow. The text will be available on the Web sites of both the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Rules.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

EXPRESSING SOLIDARITY WITH ISRAEL IN ITS FIGHT AGAINST TERRORISM

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 392) expressing solidarity with Israel in its fight against terrorism, as amended.

support terrorism will be regarded by the United States as a hostile regime”;

Whereas President Bush recently stated that he “fully understands Israel’s need to defend herself” and that he “respect(s)” the fact that Israelis have “seen a wave of suicide bombers coming to the heart of their cities and killing innocent people”;

Whereas President Bush, in his speech of April 4, 2002, stated that “the situation in which he [Arafat] finds himself today is largely of his own making”; that Arafat “missed his opportunities, and thereby betrayed the hopes of the people he’s supposed to lead”; and that, [g]iven his [Arafat’s] failure, the Israeli Government feels it must strike at terrorist networks that are killing its citizens”;

Whereas Israel’s military operations are an effort to defend itself against the unspeakable horrors of ongoing terrorism and are aimed only at dismantling the terrorist infrastructure in the Palestinian areas, an obligation Arafat himself undertook but failed to carry out; and

Whereas the process of Israeli withdrawal is nearly complete: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) stands in solidarity with Israel as it takes necessary steps to provide security to its people by dismantling the terrorist infrastructure in the Palestinian areas;

(2) remains committed to Israel’s right to self-defense and supports additional United States assistance to help Israel defend itself;

(3) condemns the recent wave of Palestinian suicide bombings;

(4) condemns the ongoing support of terror by Yasir Arafat and others members of the Palestinian leadership;

(5) demand that the Palestinian Authority at last fulfill its commitment to dismantle the terrorist infrastructure in the Palestinian areas, including any such infrastructure associated with PLO and Palestinian Authority entities tied directly to Yasir Arafat;

(6) is gravely concerned that Arafat’s actions are not those of a viable partner for peace;

(7) urges all Arab states to declare their unqualified opposition to all forms of terrorism, including suicide bombing;

(8) commends the President for his leadership in addressing the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, particularly the efforts of the Administration to engage countries throughout the region to condemn and prevent terrorism and to prevent a widening of the conflict;

(9) urges all parties in the region to pursue vigorously efforts to establish a just, lasting, and comprehensive peace in the Middle East; and

(10) encourages the international community to take action to alleviate the humanitarian needs of the Palestinian people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). Pursuant to House Resolution 404, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 30 minutes.

For what purpose does the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) rise?

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution and request half of the time.

The SPEAKER pre tempore. Is the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) opposed to the resolution?

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, no, I am not. I strongly support the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XV, the gen-

tleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) will control the time in opposition to the motion.

The Chairs recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield half of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) will control 15 minutes.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I support the pending resolution offered by my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) and by many of our colleagues.

For a moment, Mr. Speaker, put yourself in the position of the Prime Minister of Israel and more importantly in the position of the mothers and fathers of Israel. And I speak of Jews and Arabs, for both have been victims. Having concluded an agreement under which the parties foreswore the use of force to settle political disputes, you are suddenly subject to violent acts, including eventually the nearly daily horror of homicide bombings. You realize those acts are not opposed and actually seem to be supported by the leadership on the Palestine side.

What are you to do? You just take action to defend yourself, your people, your children; and that is what Israel did and the American people support it. We must, of course, think beyond the current situation.

The administration has done a good job at diffusing this crisis and minimizing the loss of life, but now they must arrive at a method to determine once and for all if Chairman Arafat, given sufficient pressure and incentive, can exert the required leadership. If not, someone with authority must take his place; but for now he is the leader of the Palestinian people and for their sake, if not his, we must go the extra mile. This will require a reconstruction on democratic grounds of the Palestinian Authority, a new deal for the Palestine people from their leaders. Good government, open markets, not corruption, cronyism and monopolies must prevail in the Palestinian areas.

The gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and I have now determined that we must add to the political and

security steps that are part of the administration’s plans. We must add an economic component to provide a prospect of a better life for the people of the region. A new Marshall Plan is needed to provide stability in the region, and I hope to develop a proposal in the near future with the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

The leadership of President Bush has been enormously helpful; and I am proud that he, the Congress, and the American people are standing up for our friends in the Middle East at this crucial moment in its history.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Democratic leader, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT).

(Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, with this resolution today the House of Representatives is standing in solidarity with the people of Israel and for peace in the Middle East. We are defending a people, a democracy, and a friend that shares our commitment to the universal values cherished by all human beings in the world.

Since 1948, America has stood with Israel when Harry Truman rejected the advice of his staff and formally recognized Israel as a sovereign nation. Since that time Israel’s strength and America’s leadership have been essential in advancing these goals. We cannot stand on the sidelines as Israel’s security and the prospect of peace are undermined.

We must not waiver in our commitment to those, Arab and Israeli alike, who have chosen the path of peace.

A few months ago I visited the Middle East and saw firsthand that Israel is in a moment of great danger. Over the past several months Israel has endured terrorist attacks unrelenting in frequency and severity. In the past 18 months, more than 450 Israelis have been killed and over 4,000 have been wounded in attacks. For a country the size of Israel, these numbers are staggering. Proportionally, this equates to more than 21,000 American deaths and over 200,000 American injuries. Yet the Israeli people remain strong, and they remain determined to increase their security and pursue a lasting peace in the region.

The American people are also committed to these goals: first, to preserve and strengthen Israel’s security; second, to help Israel and its neighbors end the violence and the threats posed by terrorism; third, to resume a dialogue among those committed to a just and lasting peace for all. This is not an issue that politics should infect.

What is important here is that Americans stand together and be bipartisan, and that the administration and the Congress speak with one voice as much as humanly possible on this issue.

We must continue to lead efforts to bring about peace in the Middle East.

We are committed to the vision of two independent states living side by side in peace, security and prosperity. We seek a resolution of the conflict between Israel and all of its neighbors. We recognize the humanitarian needs of all people in the region, and we support efforts to address these needs.

This is an important issue for the security of every human being in America, everybody in the Middle East and maybe everybody in the world. With this resolution we will stand by Israel, we will stand for peace, and we will stand for a future that brings peace and prosperity to all of the people of the Middle East.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is probably the most political nonpartisan resolution in the history of Congress. I have every bit of empathy and concern for those innocent Israelis that have lost their lives. And the statistics in the resolution, they have been demonstrated here today; but no mention has been made of the innocent Palestinians that have been killed by Israeli forces and settlers. In terms of U.S. numbers, this amounts to more than 30,000 dead, 120,000 wounded and maimed.

So let us look at this issue in a balanced approach. Let us send a balanced message to the Middle East. The tens of thousands of Americans that have come to our Nation's capital demonstrating on both sides, Israelis have come, Palestinians have come, they need to see that Washington and the Congress is balanced in our efforts here.

Neither side has fulfilled their agreements under Oslo. Let us get that straight. You have heard the attacks against Arafat. Sure he has not fulfilled them. Neither have the Israelis. Neither side, neither side is an angel here. Neither side is an angel. Let us get that on the record perfectly clear as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, we have seen this resolution or one very like it before. The same thoughts that we saw before we see before us today, and that is that this is not a balanced resolution. It is not in the interests of Israel. It is not in the interests of the Palestinian people, and it is not in the interest of the United States. It is simply a denunciation of the Palestinians, and it does nothing to set out a picture of balance as the position of the United States.

It is time the United States recognizes something. Our commitment, and I am a part of that, to Israel for its continued existence requires that there be peace in the Middle East, and it requires that the United States function as an honest broker and as a friend to all parties and to all countries in that

area. We can and we should and we do and we denounce terrorism. It is wrong.

But this denunciation of terrorism is not the kind of mechanism that will bring peace. It does not posture the United States as a friend to all. It does not posture the United States as an honest broker seeking to defend the interests of peace and to establish a place and a climate in which Israelis and Israel and Palestinians and a Palestinian state may live at peace. It simply takes one side. That is no way to get ourselves in the position of being an honest broker.

I would like to read something that was said by a man wiser than I and wiser than most of us here. He said this: "I truly tell you, we have before us today an opportunity for peace which time will never repeat and we must seize it if we are really serious in struggling for peace. If we weaken or fritter away this opportunity we shall end in a new blood-bath. He who has conspired to lose it will have the curse of humanity and history upon his head."

These are the words that Anwar Sadat spoke to the Israeli Knesset in 1977. I would remind you that Sadat, like Yitzak Rabin, paid the highest price for his search for peace.

I would tell you that until the United States recognizes the need for us and this country to function as an honest broker for peace, there will be no peace, there will be no security for Israel, there will be no security for the Palestinians and no security for the United States.

Mr. Speaker, today we are debating yet another irresponsible Congressional resolution that does absolutely nothing to help end the violence that plagues the Israeli and Palestinian people. I rise in opposition to this resolution, which at a very delicate time undermines the Bush Administration's efforts to ease tensions, end violence, and bring about a fair peace that will be acceptable and beneficial to Israelis and Palestinians. This resolution sends exactly the wrong signal at this perilous time. It will only further fan the flames of violence, increase regional instability, and compromises our war on terrorism.

With American forces engaged in battle, the Administration needs Congress to support its diplomatic efforts, particularly the effort to bring about peace in Israel and the Occupied Territories. The Administration needs Congress to support its efforts to engage both the Israelis and Palestinians as an honest broker that sees the death of any innocent human being as a tragedy and threat to the long-term interests of the parties involved, our regional allies, and the United States. Congress must stand for peace, for it is peace along that will benefit Israel, Palestine, and the United States. The Administration does not need Congress to pass one-sided, proactive measures that undermine U.S. diplomacy and our ability to address this problem, which has proven to be a cancer on Israel, Palestine, the region, and U.S. diplomacy.

Consistent and fair U.S. leadership is critical to proving Israel security and allowing the Palestinian people to live with dignity, and is the

best and perhaps only viable hope for reducing bloodshed. As bad as the situation is today, there are rays of hope that we must not block. We have an opportunity for peace, and numerous diplomatic initiatives—based on U.S. leadership and building on the Mitchell Committee Report, the Tenet plan, and the Saudi Proposal—that must move forward. These measures could prevent the widening of this conflict into a war in which there will not be a winner regardless of military outcome.

Passage of H. Res. 392 will undermine the Administration, diminish U.S. leverage with the Palestinians, and further damage U.S. credibility in the region. If the U.S. fails to act as a peace proponent now, there will most certainly be a leadership vacuum in the region. This will hurt our allies, including Israel.

Mr. Speaker, what is the vision of the Administration? Secretary Colin Powell said that is to build, "a region where Israelis and Arabs can live together in peace, security, and dignity." To do this he noted that both parties must take steps, some painful, in order to reach a just conclusion to this conflict. H. Res. 392 does not embody this vision, and it does not embody peace.

Why aren't we debating H. Con. Res. 253, a bill I introduced that endorses the Mitchell Commission recommendations? Why aren't we debating H. Res. 394, which my colleague from Oregon, Mr. DEFAZIO, introduced? Why aren't we debating H. Res. 382, that my friend ALCEE HASTINGS introduced? All these bills are balanced, and urge a peaceful settlement to the ongoing conflict that is endangering the region and the world. Why aren't we urging the parties to work with the Administration to end the violence and make peace?

Let me read you a statement made from a man wiser than I:

I truly tell you: we have before us today an opportunity for peace which time will never repeat and we must seize it if we are really serious in struggling for peace. If we weaken or fritter away this opportunity we shall end in a new blood-bath; he who has conspired to lose it will have the curse of humanity and history on his head.

Mr. Speaker, these are the words Anwar Sadat spoke to the Israeli Knesset in 1977. Sadat, like Yitzak Rabin, paid the highest personal price for peace. Let us remember these words and these brave men, and champion efforts to bring about a just and lasting peace. Let's be on the right side of history. Vote down this resolution, and support the Administration's efforts to solve this conflict and bring peace to this troubled land.

□ 1515

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 392 in expressing America's solidarity with Israel in its fight against terrorism, and I commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) for his leadership and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the ranking minority member of our committee,

for their cosponsorship of this resolution which makes several significant policy statements.

The PLO and Chairman Arafat have long been suspected, but it was only recently made clear that they were engaged in an organized deliberate campaign of terror aimed at inflicting as many casualties as possible on the Israeli population by their suicide bombings. It is obvious that Mr. Arafat has not been any partner for peace.

The amount of illegal weapons seized from the Palestinians by the Israelis is decisive evidence of their warlike intentions. Moreover, Mr. Arafat has continued to incite terror by stating with regard to the Passover massacre suicide bomber, "Oh God, give me a martyrdom like this."

This proposal concludes that Mr. Arafat and the Palestinian Authority have failed to abide by their commitments, pursued an ongoing terrorism campaign against the State of Israel. The Passover massacre was perpetrated by a terrorist whom Israel had previously had called on Mr. Arafat to arrest.

This resolution, which I am pleased to cosponsor, maintains its firm commitment to Israel's right of self-defense. Mr. Speaker, political disputes can only be solved through negotiation, through compromise and the building of trust and not by violence and certainly not by suicide bombings.

Accordingly, I strongly urge support of H. Res. 392, and I urge my colleagues to fully support this measure.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I have always been a strong supporter of the State of Israel, the people of Israel, and their need to live in peace behind secure borders, enjoying normal relations with their neighbors and the world.

I am an equally strong supporter of the rights of the Palestinian people to live in peace in their own state, behind secure borders, enjoying normal relations with their neighbors and the world.

I agree with the sponsors of this resolution that the recent spate of Palestinian suicide bombings of Israeli civilians is horrific, and deserves condemnation. We must stand united against terrorism, in all its forms.

However, I am concerned with some of the deficiencies of this resolution.

President Bush and Secretary of State Colin Powell are exerting great efforts to move the Middle East peace process forward. The United States is the only country that has the resources, the will, and the influence with both sides to help bring them to a peaceful solution.

Both President Bush and Secretary Powell have raised questions about the effect of this resolution.

The Congress should rightly praise the President's peace efforts. But we should also encourage the Arab countries to embrace the

Saudi peace proposal for an Israeli withdrawal from the occupied territories, coupled with a complete recognition and acceptance by the Arab countries of Israel's right to secure borders and normal relations with her neighbors.

It is also unfortunate that the sponsors of the resolution did not insert language sought by the Bush White House that would acknowledge the suffering of the Palestinian people.

Peace will not come to this region until both sides are willing to give up some of their maximal goals, including the questions of refugees and settlements. And it means both sides must be invested in the success of the peace process and in maintaining peaceful relations between the Israeli and Palestinian peoples.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote for H. Res. 392, despite its deficiencies as a way of expressing solidarity with the people of Israel during a time of strife. But we must never lose sight of the need to also acknowledge the suffering and the political rights and aspirations of the Palestinian people.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, in the last 18 months we have watched while nearly 400 Israelis, mostly civilians, have died in the violence in the Middle East. We have watched the escalation that has cost so many Palestinians their lives in a senseless intifada. We seek an end to violence and we ask for peace to all the people of the Middle East.

The established Palestinian leadership cannot decide on which side of the line they stand, but this is a moral line that one cannot straddle in pursuit of political goals. Whether or not they ordered the terrorists into action or whether they turned a blind eye, it is they who are responsible for the violence that kills the innocent and kills the young people who are suicide bombers today.

Israel is not perfect, but I believe that Israel does not wage war on innocents. Israel knows that there is no compromise with terrorism.

America lost its innocence after September 11, and that caused us again to view and understand of the forces of evil that can threaten our survival. There is no more important moment for solidarity. With only 6 million people in the preciously small place, Israel needs our voice. Our solidarity is borne of our common instinctive response to that September 11 attack. With this resolution, we renew the solidarity in a common cause.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

(Mrs. CLAYTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from West Virginia for yielding me the time.

I am going to enter into the RECORD at this point a statement by Desmond Tutu, who asks for a balance for peace and a way to bring peace together.

[From the Guardian, Apr. 29, 2002]

APARTHEID IN THE HOLY LAND

(By Desmond Tutu)

In our struggle against apartheid, the great supporters were Jewish people. They almost instinctively had to be on the side of the disenfranchised, of the voiceless ones, fighting injustice, oppression and evil. I have continued to feel strongly with the Jews. I am patron of a holocaust center in South Africa. I believe Israel has a right to secure borders.

What is not so understandable, not justified, is what it did to another people to guarantee its existence. I've been very deeply distressed in my visit to the Holy Land; it reminded me so much of what happened to us black people in South Africa. I have seen the humiliation of the Palestinians at checkpoints and roadblocks, suffering like us when young white police officers prevented us from moving about.

On one of my visits to the Holy Land I drove to a church with the Anglican bishop in Jerusalem. I could hear tears in his voice as he pointed to Jewish settlements. I thought of the desire of Israelis for security. But what of the Palestinians who have lost their land and homes?

I have experienced Palestinians pointing to what were their homes, now occupied by Jewish Israelis. I was walking with Canon Naim Ateek (the head of the Sabeel Ecumenical Centre) in Jerusalem. He pointed and said: "Our home was over there. We were driven out of our home; it is now occupied by Israeli Jews."

My heart aches. I say why are our memories so short. Have our Jewish sisters and brothers forgotten their humiliation? Have they forgotten the collective punishment, the home demolitions, in their own history so soon? Have they turned their backs on their profound and noble religious traditions? Have they forgotten that God cares deeply about the downtrodden?

Israel will never get true security and safety through oppressing another people. A true peace can ultimately be built only on justice. We condemn the violence of suicide bombers, and we condemn the corruption of young minds taught hatred; but we also condemn the violence of military incursions in the occupied lands, and the inhumanity that won't let ambulances reach the injured.

The military action of recent days, I predict with certainty, will not provide the security and peace Israelis want; it will only intensify the hatred.

Israel has three options: revert to the previous stalemated situation; exterminate all Palestinians; or—I hope—to strive for peace based on justice, based on withdrawal from all the occupied territories, and the establishment of a viable Palestinian state on those territories side by side with Israel, both with secure borders.

We in South Africa had a relatively peaceful transition. If our madness could end as it did, it must be possible to do the same everywhere else in the world. If peace could come to South Africa, surely it can come to the Holy Land?

My brother Naim Ateek has said what we used to say: "I am not pro-this people or that. I am pro-justice, pro-freedom. I am anti-injustice, anti-oppression."

But you know as well as I do that, somehow, the Israeli government is placed on a pedestal [in the US], and to criticize it is to be immediately dubbed anti-semitic, as if the Palestinians were not semitic. I am not even anti-white, despite the madness of that group. And how did it come about that Israel was collaborating with the apartheid government on security measures?

People are scared in this country [the US], to say wrong is wrong because the Jewish

lobby is powerful—very powerful. Well, so what? For goodness sake, this is God's world! We live in a moral universe. The apartheid government was very powerful, but today it no longer exists. Hitler, Mussolini, Stalin, Pinochet, Milosevic, and Idi Amin were all powerful, but in the end they bit the dust.

Injustice and oppression will never prevail. Those who are powerful have to remember the litmus test that God gives to the powerful: what is your treatment of the poor, the hungry, the voiceless? And on the basis of that, God passes judgment.

We should put out a clarion call to the government of the people of Israel, to the Palestinian people and say: peace is possible, peace based on justice is possible. We will do all we can to assist you to achieve this peace, because it is God's dream, and you will be able to live amicably together as sisters and brothers.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, Oh, little town of Bethlehem, we witness and we cry, Israelis and Palestinians, both practice eye for eye.

Made blind by rage and terror, they make a just God cry, and crush the hopes of all the years while still more children die.

Our senators and congressmen produce a rash appeal, selective words of blame are used, instead of words that heal.

Put politics and word games before the cause of peace and make it still more difficult to bring the region peace.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) for yielding the time to me.

I have been in the People's House, Mr. Speaker, for nine terms, and during each term, peace in the Middle East has been debated at length. Here we are again today.

I care not who speaks for Israel or for the PLO, but I do care who rejects terrorism and who embraces it. We cannot stand idly by and see innocent persons slain day after day. This peace process must be driven by reason, not anger and hostility.

Israel has demonstrated that it can live in peace with its Arab neighbors, and reasonable men and women representing each side of this conflict should formulate a peace plan whereby bloodshed in the Middle East becomes a sordid plank of the past, and peace, an ingredient that sweeps across the Middle East, to be enjoyed by Israelis as well as Palestinians.

This should be our prayer.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this important resolution. On September 11, raw, cold blooded terror exploded in the United States of America, the type of terror that Israelis know far too well.

Here in the United States we point to one single day, September 11, and re-

member the unspeakable carnage and terror. Israelis cannot point to one single day of terror because they live with terror every single day.

As someone who lost a family member on September 11, each time a homicide bomber attacks a cafe in Israel, it reawakens my grief and my anger, and I know the impact of each explosion is felt in the hearts and minds of every single American.

Israel and the United States are fighting the same enemy. Our enemies have different faces but a common objective.

The U.S. has found it easy to identify our enemy but often difficult to identify our true friends. A friend is someone with whom one shares a common cause and struggle. Our cause is peace and our friend is Israel.

It is time to stand up and speak with one resolute voice and say, Israel, we are in this together.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, is there anyone in this body or Nation that does not know that the U.S. government is friendly with Israel and supports their cause? Now, I would ask the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the chairman, why were there no hearings? I would ask the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the ranking member, why were there no hearings?

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I will be delighted to respond to the gentleman.

There was no reason for the lack of hearings. This issue has been discussed ad nauseam and ad infinitum, and the tragedy which is unfolding in the area compelled us to move expeditiously. We will be delighted to have extended hearings, as I am sure the Chairman plans, on the whole issue of peace in the Middle East.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, as my ranking member and friend knows, we are trying to construct an environment that we can talk about this matter among ourselves and that there needs to be a national dialogue around the country.

I have talked with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) about it, to which he has agreed. I have talked with the senior Senators from Delaware, North Dakota, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Here is what Martin Luther King said, "We are caught in an inescapable network of mutuality, tied in a single garment of destiny."

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted and proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), our distinguished Democratic whip, and my friend and neighbor.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, today as we are engaged in this very sad and difficult debate on this floor of the House, there is an ongoing tragedy in the Middle East, and indeed, we mourn the loss of life on both sides of the conflict.

Yes, the U.S. and Israel have had an unbreakable friendship based on our shared commitment to peace, stability and democracy. A secure Israel can only prevail if there is peace in the Middle East.

Less than 2 years ago, Israeli and Palestinian leaders met at Camp David, and we were hopeful of an agreement that all issues of permanent status, including the establishment of a Palestinian state and a secure State of Israel would be resolved.

Prime Minister Barak made a generous and historic proposal. Chairman Arafat missed that historic opportunity when he failed to seize it and to negotiate a peaceful settlement of the Middle East crisis.

We must return to that effort sooner rather than later. Neither Israel nor the Palestinians can afford to abandon the search for peace.

The United States must lead at this critical time. We know that when the United States is involved, there is less violence in the Middle East.

Terrorism and suicide bombings must not be the price that is paid for a free society. The goal of terrorists is to instill fear. They kill not just to destroy lives but to change the way people live and the way a country thrives.

In order to build a better future for his people, Chairman Arafat must become a viable partner for peace. It is only through honest negotiations, not through violence, that the Palestinians can achieve their goal, which most of us support, the creation of a Palestinian state.

That is why I am pleased that the resolution before us today calls for the international community to provide humanitarian assistance to Palestinians, and the United States must be a strong part of that. We must build upon the efforts of the heroes who have built the foundation for peace. We must honor the legacy of the martyr for peace, Prime Minister Rabin, and work for a secure Israel and for peace in the Middle East. As I said, that can only happen with a secure Palestinian state.

In the spirit of Rabin, we must be guided by his words, "No more bloodshed, no more tears."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) has 9½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) has 10 minutes remaining. The gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) has 23½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I declare my support for the State of Israel and the security of the Israeli people. I

also declare my support for a Palestinian state and the security of a Palestinian people. So I will vote present today because I believe the security of Israel requires the security of the Palestinians.

I will vote present because I believe the United States can do better through honest brokering and a principled commitment to peaceful coexistence. Today we are missing an opportunity to lead people of the Middle East toward a secure and stable future together.

This resolution equates Israel's dilemma, which is the outcome of the Palestinian struggle for self-determination, with the United States campaign against the criminal organization, al Qaeda. Unfortunately, our own policy is undefined, amorphous, without borders, without limits and without congressional oversight.

For this Congress to place the historic Israeli-Palestinian conflict into the context of the current fashion of U.S. global policy pitches, Israelis and Palestinians alike into a black hole of policy without purpose and conflict, without resolution.

The same humanity which requires us to acknowledge with profound concern the pain and suffering of the people of Israel requires a similar expression for the pain and suffering of the Palestinians. When our brothers and sisters are fighting to the death, instead of declaring solidarity with one against the other, should we not declare solidarity with both for peace so that both may live in security and freedom?

If we seek to require the Palestinians who do not have their own state to adhere to a higher standard of conduct, should we not also ask Israel with over a half century experience with Statehood to adhere to a basic standard of conduct, including meeting the requirements of international law?

There is a role for the Congress and the administration in helping to bring a lasting peace in the Middle East. However, this resolution does not create that role.

□ 1530

After today, we will still need to determine a course of action to bring about peace. This course will require multilateral diplomacy, which strengthens cooperation among all countries in the region. It will require focused, unwavering attention. It will require sufficient financial resources. And it will require that our Nation have the political will to bring about a true and a fair and sustainable resolution of the conflict.

When this Congress enters into the conflict and takes sides between Israel and Palestine, we do not help to achieve peace, but the opposite. Similarly, the administration should consider that when it conducts a war against terrorism without limits, the principle of war is quickened everywhere in the world, including the Mid-

dle East. When it talks incessantly about invading Iraq, the tempo of war is picked up everywhere.

If we truly want peace in the Middle East, this resolution is counterproductive. I will vote "present" because I do not believe this resolution dignifies the role towards creating peace which this Congress can and must fulfill.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), my very learned colleague.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, September 11 showed Americans the results of the devastating effects of terrorism in our lives and communities. Sadly, citizens of Israel must deal with terrorism every day. The terrorists want to destroy Israel. As the only democracy in the Middle East, Israel embodies the ideals and virtues that we treasure as Americans.

Let us support the people of Israel. The peace will only come when Israel and its Arab neighbors come together and work out a realistic and honest agreement. For that to occur, acts of terrorism must end and Israel's right to exist in peace must be recognized and honored.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

(Mr. SHERMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, today Israel faces an attack on its continued existence by those who reject a two-state solution. Now is the time for us to demonstrate our solidarity with those under terrorist attack. We should not be balanced between those who target civilians for death and those seeking to protect themselves from terror.

For those who thirst for balance, recognize that this resolution is but a drop in the bucket of world commentary, and this resolution will help balance, will help offset the rash of anti-Israel diatribes and anti-Semitic violence.

Some will disagree with the exact drafting of this or that clause in this resolution, but the world will little notice the exact text however. The vote total, will blaze in headlines worldwide. Let that vote total demonstrate that no one can drive a wedge between the United States and Israel, and no one can drive a wedge between Democrats and the pro-Israel community.

Vote yes!

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in the cause of peace and to express my concern about the content and the timing of this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to vote "present."

Just before we adjourned last year, I introduced House Resolution 328, a bill expressing the sense of Congress that during the holiday season peace should be America's top priority in the Middle

East. I was greatly disappointed, in fact I was shocked, that the leadership refused to bring up such a mild but hopeful bill on this floor. They never considered peace a priority.

The killing escalated over the holidays and into this year. What a corrosive impact this is having on the young minds of our world. If Congress truly wants to encourage peace, then let us do it constructively.

I agree with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) that hundreds more innocent Israelis and Palestinians have died tragically in the ongoing violence. But his one-sided resolution will only fan the killing frenzy. It offers no encouragement for the Arab states to have a place at the peace table.

Israel cannot make peace alone. This resolution envisions no Palestinian state as key in the peace process. At its worst, I fear it represents crass domestic politics in this election year. By contrast, President Bush and Secretary Powell have both asked that Congress put this bill on hold.

Instead of supporting our ally, Israel, this resolution further endangers the delicate balance so necessary to bring peace to the entire region. Let us be a true partner for peace, not just with Israel but as well with the Arab states in the region, surely those that have suffered bloodshed in their common cause with Israel, for a just and lasting peace.

Mr. Speaker, a just peace process must be inclusive or it will not be sustained. America must stand for inclusion. I urge the Members to vote "present" on this resolution, and in this way we will demonstrate America's continuing support for Israel but also that this resolution is half-drawn and ill-timed.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON).

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I am going to support this resolution. There is no question about it. We have to support Israel, irrespective of what party is in charge. The people of Israel are our friends. In these horrible and dangerous times, we just cannot turn our back on them. They have to know we are there for them.

Having said that, I must admit that I think the timing of this resolution leaves a lot to be desired. Here we are at a point of high tension. Both Israelis and the Palestinians are wounded and desperate and looking to us for leadership. Secretary Powell has come back from his trip and Prince Abdullah has made his suggestions. As we sit here, the quartet, the U.S.-U.N., U.N.-EU, and the Russian Federation are hammering out some sort of resolution in the White House.

We must support Israel, but we must not turn our back against those on the other side, and they should know that, because our objective, primarily, has got to be peace.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

(Mr. ENGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution, in support of Israel, our best ally, with whom we have shared values; freedom of the press, freedom of speech. Israel is an outpost of western democracy in a sea of dictatorships and tyrants. If we, rightfully so, can go halfway around the world to combat terror in Afghanistan, surely Israel should be allowed to do the same in her own backyard.

For those who say the timing is wrong, the timing is right. Arafat has to know now that we will not allow him to use terror as a negotiating tool. The terror that has come out with the suicide bombers, three-quarters of those are affiliated with Arafat's Fateh group. We have to be consistent in the fight of against terrorism. No double standard. Because if we have a double standard, it undermines our fight against terrorism, and there is no moral equivalency between terrorism and self-defense.

People who say we should be more balanced, why is the rest of the world not balanced? The Arabs will understand and will make peace when they know that our bond with Israel is unshakable. And this resolution goes a long way in solidifying that bond.

We must vote "yes." Vote against terror, vote "yes" on the resolution.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio), a gentleman who has sponsored a very balanced resolution in this body.

Mr. DEFazio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

When Yasir Arafat walked away from the peace agreement so painfully negotiated with President Clinton and Prime Minister Barak, he was recklessly irresponsible and not a leader in the interest of peace. He provided the fuel for the current endless, downward spiral of violence.

But when Ariel Sharon engaged in provocative foray to the Temple Mount to foster his political ambitions, he provided the spark that ignited the fuel of Arafat and the current violence. And his actions since then have only fanned the flames. These are not men who will lead to peace, neither of them.

The United States must stand tall as a powerful and honest broker of a balanced plan for peace. I believe that President Bush and Secretary of State Powell have made a strong and credible effort to bring an end to the violence and to begin a negotiated peace. They have offered a balanced plan. I have offered a resolution which mirrors their balanced plan. It will not be considered. It is not allowed to be debated. It will not be voted upon as an alternative. We only have this one resolu-

tion before us, which is totally slanted and biased and will only encourage more irresponsibility by Ariel Sharon.

I thought there was one thing that might turn the tide in this struggle, and it was a horrible tragedy in the end of March. Look at these two young women. They look like sisters. One, Ayat al-Akhras, 18, was a suicide bomber who killed Rachel Levy at the grocery store, age 17. I thought that both sides would be so appalled by this unbelievable tragedy and see the hopelessness of this that they might turn toward peace. But, no, that has not happened there.

Let that happen here, in the home of democracy and peace. Let us not have the United States Congress somewhere to the right of the Likud in Israel. Let us have the United States Congress stand up for the American people, for peace and democracy in the Middle East. And this resolution that we are being forced to vote on today will not lead us in that direction.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on East Asia and the Pacific.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for this resolution, with reservations. I will vote for it because the opposite perspective would be inexplicable. However, I have reservations on process and substantive grounds.

This resolution is pressed in this body at this time, without administration support and without review by the committee of jurisdiction, all apparently because of concern that the Senate might competitively address the issue before the House.

Substantively this resolution is unbalanced, untimely, and potentially counterproductive to the foreign policy interests of the United States and, implicitly, the viability of the State of Israel.

It is the case that this Congress must unequivocally support the existence of the state of Israel. This is a moral imperative. But if Israel is to provide security for its people, it must recognize that the Palestinian people, despite a leadership that has miserved it, have legitimate aspirations. There can be no security for either Israelis or Palestinians unless fair and equitable borders are established delineating both a Palestinian and Israeli state.

This resolution asserts a common U.S.-Israeli position on terrorism. The more difficult quid pro quo is to come: The expectation that if the United States and international community broker a credible peace agreement, the Knesset will seize the future and rise above the politics of the moment.

We in this body can express with ease, and perhaps too much glibness, rhetorical concerns of the nature contained in this bill. What will be quantumly more difficult is for the Knesset and the Palestinian Authority to reach an accord that can provide for a future of peace and stability. Parties

in the region simply must demonstrate more courage and more balanced judgment than this Congress is doing today.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, before yielding to my next speaker, to just point out to my colleague who equated a suicide bomber with a victim that that is precisely what this resolution is all about. There is no moral equivalence between a suicide bomber and an innocent victim of a suicide bomber. I find this analogy he portrayed sickening.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL).

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

With the passage of this resolution, we stand in solidarity with Israel and with her people, and offer our support and our sympathy. We are outraged by the use of terror against innocent civilians. It is time for the Arab leaders and the Palestinian leaders to completely renounce the use of terror, in word and in deed.

There is no moral equivalency, as my friend from California has said, between the use of terror against innocent civilians and with Israeli self-defense. There are simple truths here. Israel has the right to defend herself, and this country should not be putting limits on that right of self-defense.

I will join three of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, in a trip this weekend to Israel to demonstrate by our presence the solidarity and concern and support that this House will voice through a majority vote here today.

□ 1545

We stand with Israel. Our support is rock solid, and Israel will survive.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR).

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution. This resolution blindly supports Israel's actions against the Palestinians and wholly denies the generations of suffering of the Palestinian people. This would be wrong at any time, but in light of what has happened at Jenin and Bethlehem, Ramallah, Haifa, Jerusalem, and Netanya, and what continues to happen today, this resolution is dangerous.

Like most Americans, I support Israel. However, just like most Americans, I do not support and will not support all of Israel's policies. Generations of Palestinians and Israelis have suffered in the region, but the violence of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict cannot be examined or addressed in isolation of decades of occupation of millions of Palestinians.

Israeli suffering is something that this body understands and discusses. But what of the suffering of the Palestinian people? What of the history of

land confiscation, water rights, torture, settlements, collective punishments, home demolitions, curfews, administrative detentions, expulsions, child labor? Where is the language about the 1,000-plus Palestinians killed in the last 19 months, bodies found under rubble? Where is the language about the thousands made homeless by the bulldozers in Jenin alone? Where is the language about the relief agencies denied access to treat the sick and wounded? We know that relief agencies, including the International Committee of the Red Cross, were prevented from reaching and evacuating and treating the sick and wounded throughout the West Bank and Gaza Strip, resulting in untold deaths, from the mother who bled to death from a normally nonfatal wound in front of her children, to the couple buried alive under rubble for 8 days. The stories coming to light are horrific.

Rarely on this floor is there discussion of the nearly 420 Palestinian villages destroyed at the time of Israel's founding in 1948, or the 3.8 million refugees registered by the United Nations or the estimated 2 million others not registered. Palestinians live in 59 different recognized refugee camps in misery, in poverty, with no hope of a better future for the next generations that are born into those camps.

Can we know today what 38 percent employment in the West Bank or 75 percent unemployment in Gaza can do to a population? While we cling to the hope of peace that Oslo would bring, Palestinians saw a remarkable growth in settlements. As of February, Peace Now estimates the settlers' population at 230,000, having approximately doubled in the last 10 years under Oslo.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a good resolution. I encourage Members to vote against it.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY).

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and as an advocate of a strong American-Israeli relationship. No country in the world is more familiar with what we Americans experienced on September 11 than is Israel.

There are those who object to Israel's actions of self-defense. I ask those Members, what is America doing in Afghanistan? Are Israeli victims of terror in some way different from American victims? Do Americans have a right to self-defense and Israelis a right to die? The peace process is dead because the Palestinians killed it. It is time for Yasir Arafat and the so-called Palestinian leadership to express their desire for a Palestinian state living peacefully next to Israel rather than a Palestinian state in the place of Israel; and they need to say it in English and Arabic.

The crisis in the Middle East has nothing to do with a Palestinian homeland. The Israelis have agreed to that long ago. It has everything to do with

the survival of the State of Israel, which the Palestinians have yet to recognize. This resolution sends a clear message to the supporters of terrorism and the enemies of Israel that America will never be an ally to those who commit terror.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all Members to support this resolution and stand, as this Member does, side by side with the people of the State of Israel.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

(Mr. INSLEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, of course Israel has a right to a military response to this immoral terrorism. Of course we stand with Israel. But this resolution has a major omission: it is too weak for America. It does not cut the mustard for America because it does not allow America to fulfill its manifest destiny of the only hope in the world of a force for peace to be an honest broker to help find justice and peace in this region of the world.

It rightfully expresses our permanent, unalterable commitment to the security of a Jewish state in Israel, and it wrongfully excludes any reference, any reference of a recognition or even our interest in recognizing the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian people for a viable state of their own. This is the national policy of the United States of America, but it was omitted from this resolution for partisan, political purposes.

We rightfully condemn suicide bombing, but we cannot blind ourselves to the reality that when the world's only superpower totally ignores one people, it cannot serve effectively to bring peace to the other. We owe the Israeli people more than blind obedience to any of their government's policies. We cannot be a blinded giant. We owe them honesty, and it is honest to say that a national policy of refusing to accept and recognize the legitimate right of Palestinians to a viable state is not a step on the road to peace. Ultimately there will be justice for both, or there will be peace for neither. We know that violence breeds when hope dies and both parties are blinded by hate. Only we can bring hope to this region.

Mr. Speaker, in doing so, we ought to give Israel the same love and assistance we would give our own brother. So as we would speak up when our brother makes a judgment as to his own harm, so we ought to speak out and say that the settlement policy on the West Bank is hurting Israel. In our acquiescence, our silence in this resolution hurts Israel and does not serve her true vision of high moral values for which we have always admired her.

Mr. Speaker, to make it abundantly clear what this debate is about, and I see the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) has stepped out, I would ask the majority party: Would the majority leadership accept a unanimous consent

request to add to this resolution a simple sentence that would recognize the hope of the American people that both these parties can find viable states of their own, living in peace, one next to the other?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. INSLEE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to accept that statement at this time.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, that is most regrettable because that is the aspiration of the American people and the world, and we ought to fulfill it.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that I must vote against this resolution, not for what it says, but for what it does not say. Of course I agree with the strong condemnation of Palestinian suicide bombings killing so many innocent Israeli civilians. Terrorism is utterly intolerable, and it cannot be rationalized by other injustices.

The Palestinian leadership's choice of violence against the innocent as a weapon of war does in fact justify retaliation. But how I wish we could have a leader with the greatness of Ghandi in the Middle East who understood that violence begets violence, as it has catapulted the region into killing and destruction.

I must oppose this resolution because it is unbalanced and, thus, I believe counterproductive in bringing long-term peace and security to the people of Israel. It does not reference President Bush's words of April 4 and America's consistent foreign policy that Israel must stop the expansion and withdraw from the Palestinian-controlled territories before a sustainable peace can be achieved.

This country supports U.N. Resolution 242, and Israel's unwillingness to comply is a contributing factor to the cycle of violence and despair.

This House resolution does not make it clear, as Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz said before thousands at an Israeli rally that America mourns the deaths of all innocent life, Israeli and Palestinian. Over 1,500 Palestinians and 500 Israelis have been killed just since September.

Yes, many Arabs hate the U.S. for our prosperity and our way of life, but they especially hate us because they see us as turning a blind eye towards the aggression and adding to the daily humiliation that hardens the hearts of even the most peace-loving Palestinian people. And, yes, shame on the Arab states for too often being part of the problem rather than the solution, but their values and actions are not the standard by which we must measure ours. Our response should not be to further alienate these states, thus undercutting our efforts to persuade our Arab allies to help stem the Palestinian violence.

We as a Nation are defined by our respect for all innocent human life, and believe that our power has a purpose to promote peace, understanding and mutual interdependence among all of the neighbors of the world. When whole towns and villages are reduced to rubble, when innocent loved ones are killed indiscriminately, and when the Palestinian people have been treated with such contempt by their occupiers, it breeds rage and desperation among a whole new generation of avengers; and a whole new cycle of vengeance, by any means, begins. That is not in our interest; and it is certainly not in Israel's interest, whose existence, security and future is not best served by this unbalanced resolution; and that is why it should be rejected.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA).

(Mr. ISSA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yield me this time to speak in favor of a bill, not because it is perfect, because like many of our resolutions, and like many Members have said, it is less than perfect. It does not speak in a balanced fashion about some of the other shortcomings.

But I believe on the floor today we have to make a statement, a statement that the violence must end. A statement that now that Chairman Arafat has at least limited freedom of movement again, that he use this second chance to bring about an end to violence and a resumption in the altogether too necessary compromises that must be made if we are going to have peace in the Middle East, peace that will benefit both sides, that will end the violence on both sides, that will save lives on both sides.

□ 1600

So although we could all speak and speak rightfully about what is not in this legislation, or even what is maybe wrong in the resolution, I would ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for this, to make this strong statement.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

(Mr. LYNCH and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I realize that there are many Members that wanted to speak on this resolution today; and unfortunately for me, my seniority does not allow me to have an opportunity to speak.

I have some remarks here, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of this resolution and in support of the people of Israel, and I will enter them into the RECORD at a later date.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER).

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, the United States must stand in solidarity with Israel during this devastating time. Hundreds of Israelis have been murdered by Palestinian terrorists; and make no mistake, Yasir Arafat is directly responsible. The stark reality is that Arafat is no longer even remotely a partner in peace. Just the opposite. Arafat has eviscerated the promise he made at Oslo to renounce the use of violence against Israel. Just as we as Americans defend ourselves against terror, Israelis have the right, the obligation, to defend themselves against terror.

It is unacceptable to condemn both Israel and Arafat simultaneously, as if there was any moral equivalency in their actions. This Congress must never rationalize or explain away acts of terror. What should be the message from Washington to Israel is, Mr. Sharon, defend your people, destroy the infrastructure of terror, and know that America stands with you.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, sometimes God puts you at the right place at the right time, and I know he did not want to hear that from us from the floor of the House. I know what he wanted to hear from us was let there be peace on Earth, and let it begin with me. Let there be peace on Earth, and let it begin with me.

Let me step up to the plate and say to the world, I want peace, and I am going to do what it takes to give peace. Let me step up to the plate and say to the world, I have it within my power, within my hand, to make peace.

As a kid, remember that saying they used to say, "sticks and stones may break my bones, but names will never hurt me"? All we have is names on this piece of paper, throwing words.

If we as a Congress sincerely believe in peace in the Middle East, let us get on some planes and go over there and sit down and talk to the people in the Middle East and make a difference. Let us stop talking and step up and give some action.

I support Israel. I support Israel. My congressional district has many, many people of Jewish descent; and I am pleased to represent them, but I am pleased to believe in peace. Let there be peace on Earth, and let it begin with this Congress. Let us stop throwing words across the floor and every which way and make a difference.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I think it has been established that I am pro-Israel and I am also pro-peace and I am also pro-Palestine. We need to find a way to bring people together.

I just want to quote just very briefly from a very insightful article by Desmond Tutu. He says, "In our strug-

gle against apartheid, the great supporters were Jewish people. They almost instinctively had to be on the side of the disenfranchised, of the voiceless ones, fighting injustice, oppression and evil. I have continued to feel strongly with the Jews. I am a patron of a Holocaust center in South Africa. I believe Israel has a right to secure borders.

"What is not so understandable, however, not justified, is what it did to another people to guarantee its existence. I have been very deeply distressed in my love for them and my love for the Holy Land. It reminds me much of what has happened to us as black people in South Africa. I have seen the humiliation of the Palestinians. Surely there are those who want terror, but not all the Palestinians. We need to find how we bring our beloved Israel and Palestine together for peace."

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH).

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to read the resolution, because what the resolution does is it speaks truth to power. Some of my colleagues who have spoken against the resolution I do not believe have read it, because there is nothing that is factually inaccurate in this resolution.

It talks about, unfortunately, what is going on in Israel today. There is no Yasir Arafat exemption to the war on terrorism. What is going on today in fact is terrorist actions; and when those bombs are going off, whether it is in a Cafe in Haifa or Jerusalem or Natanya, they are not just trying to kill Jews. In fact, some Arabs have been killed, many Arabs have been killed by terrorist acts themselves. But in essence it is terrorist action against America.

We need to pass this resolution. There are other issues we can talk about at another time. I urge my colleagues to read the resolution. As my good friend and colleague from California on the other aisle, who has been as concerned as any Member in this Chamber of the plight of the Palestinian people, and I praise him for his commitment to vote yes, I urge my friends and my colleagues on this side of the aisle to join with him and let there be no votes against this resolution, even with the objections that people have to the fact that some things are left out.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

(Mrs. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time and for his leadership on this important issue, and I stand strongly in support of his resolution.

For 54 years, Israel has experienced terrorist attacks similar to the ones our country suffered on September 11.

After 9-11, our country took swift and sure action against the al Qaeda. Every Nation has the right to protect its population against terrorists, particularly terrorists that target civilians. That is what we are doing in the U.S., and that is what Israel should be allowed to do.

The world should recognize that Israel has the right to use military means to protect its citizens and its borders. I welcome President Bush's decision to increase American involvement in efforts to reach a diplomatic solution to the current violence. Israelis and Palestinians must find a way to live peacefully with each other, and we have the moral obligation and strategic imperative to make that happen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) has 2½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) has 5½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) has 4½ minutes remaining and the right to close.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate those who have taken part in this debate. Except for a few shrill voices, there has been an honest exchange of views by all the Members here. And although that does not correct a faulty proceeding that brought this measure to the floor without a single hearing, can you imagine a motion of this moment, a resolution of this gravity, to never land down in the Committee on International Relations? I would say to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), you are a political genius. What you know about foreign affairs, we will determine in the months to come.

But what is most needed in Washington is an inclusive, open and respectful dialogue. And guess who has got to lead it? Us. There is nobody else in the United States. The Congress has to lead the dialogue.

In the world, the United States has to lead the dialogue. Is there anyone that has a reservation about that point? I would yield to them immediately. Because we know that if peace is to come to the troubled Holy Land, it will come with the United States of America playing the major role as mediator, facilitator, and monitor. So our credibility must be as impeccable as we can possibly make it.

The Secretary of State has told us very clearly that certain resolutions hinder our ability to play a constructive role. The Secretary of State says we must be very careful about the messages we send. The President of the United States begged the gentleman from Texas not to send anything to the floor only recently.

So what I am saying is that we must realize that our role is not merely taking sides, but is acting as the world leader. It is in our hands, it is only in our hands, and I urge you to conduct yourselves accordingly.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, Israel, like every other nation, has the right to self-defense. This resolution expresses our solidarity with Israel as she defends herself against the barbaric campaign of terrorism and expresses our determination that the violence must end.

We are told the resolution is not balanced, but we should not be balanced between Palestinian terrorists and Israeli victims; between an Israel that offered breathtaking concessions for peace, and Arafat, who walked away from the table and deliberately started a war.

We should not be balanced between the Palestinian Authority, whose method of negotiation is to murder as many Israeli civilians as possible in restaurants and pizza parlors and Passover seders, and Israel which exercises its right to defend its people by attacking terrorists and gunmen, not innocent civilians.

We all want peace, but to attain peace we must stand in solidarity with Israel so Israel can feel secure in seeking peace.

We can and should be an even-handed broker during negotiations, but we must stand forthrightly with Israel now against the terrorists if there are ever to be again real negotiations.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close on my side.

Mr. Speaker, this has been an interesting debate today; and I do congratulate all those that have participated in it and followed it, because it is a very emotional issue, it is a very difficult issue and a very delicate issue.

There is no question, as I said in my opening comments, that America stands by Israel. They are our ally and should always be. Israel must protect itself. But the important question that we must ask is how Israel must protect itself.

The first step is to acknowledge its role in creating the violent conditions in the region. The time has come to stop blaming everything on Arafat. That just will not get it anymore. Getting Arafat is no solution. I am not here to defend him, nor defend his actions. But getting Arafat is not the solution that is going to bring us peace.

Continued humiliation is no solution. This is a method of operation of bullies, not of those who want to return to the peace process, to the negotiating table. "Whereas anybody involved," that means give and take. Is that the real fear here of going to the negotiating table, where it means you have to give up something? Does the father of the Israeli settlement policy, the current Prime Minister, really fear about going to negotiations? That is a question that I think is legitimate to ask.

□ 1615

The military option will not secure a peace in the Middle East. The military option will not work. No peace can be achieved. There are many steps that we can take to offer a balanced approach too numerous to mention at this particular time. But the bottom line is we cannot dispossess a people and then attempt to govern them by occupying their land, by forcing them to subsist in refugee camps, by blocking roadways to their jobs, by refusing access to medical attention, by cutting them off from their schools and universities, and by discounting their humanity. This is not the roadway to peace.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I think the bottom line is the Palestinians crave the recognition of their dignity; Israelis crave the dignity of recognition. It is incumbent upon this Congress to recognize both and do both. I ask for rejection of this one-sided resolution.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 1½ minutes so that we may accommodate the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK). She will be our last speaker before I close.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent that both the opponents and proponents of the resolution be given an additional 1½ minutes?

Mr. LANTOS. I am delighted to do so, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I really do not want to object, but a lot of people are trying to get planes this afternoon. The weather is very questionable. I am sure her minute and a half is not going to upset us too much, but if we could hold it to that.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, we appreciate that very much.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, but I do want to note that this has been a good debate, and I would not object to the extension of more time, even another hour or 2, or even 3 hours. I think we need to debate this issue more fully. It certainly has been debated fully in the Knesset in Israel, and I am glad to see this debate in the House of Representatives this afternoon, and I hope we will have more such debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) each will receive an additional 1½ minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK).

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for yielding me this time.

Unlike many of my colleagues, I do not profess to be a professor of foreign affairs, nor a diplomat. I come to this floor today to speak to my colleagues about Israel. I am a friend of Israel and I have been for more than 40 years. I do not plan to change now. I will remain so. I think the people of Israel and Israel itself has been my friend, so I do not plan to stay away from a friend of such long standing. I think that we should pass this resolution. We should not worry about the timeliness of it, but we should think about whether it is right or whether it is wrong, and when it comes to helping a friend who has been our friend for many years, a friend who believes in democracy, and a friend who believes in freedom.

So we do not have a big debate here today, but we have people who believe in the right thing as they see it. The people of Israel deserve our support at this time. Whenever we have a friend in trouble, what do we do? We stand alongside of that friend. There is no right and left of this issue. There is only the right way, the straight and narrow way. It is a hard decision for many of my colleagues who are experts in foreign affairs, but I am saying be an expert of the people of Israel who have had to suffer for many years.

Now is the time for us to stand up, straighten up and fly right. There is no good frog that will not praise his own pond. Israel is a part of our pond.

Let there be no mistake about it, I am a friend of Israel—I have been since the forties—I will remain so. Israel must continue to have the right to exist.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this important resolution expressing our solidarity with Israel in its fight against terrorism. Mr. Speaker, this resolution sends a vital message: that we stand firmly with Israel and for peace and justice within the region. There's a debate as to the timeliness of this resolution—but I think the real issue is to stand up for peace at any time the people of Israel and their friends have stood for me.

The resolution reaffirms our unwavering commitment to Israel's security and welfare, to the special relationship between the United States and Israel, and to the values of democracy and freedom that our two countries share. It supports Israel's right to defend its people from terrorism. I stand firmly with Israel and against terrorism. All of us should.

Mr. Speaker, I fervently hope and pray that our efforts and those of the parties to the ongoing negotiations will achieve a real peace in the region and justice for Israelis and Palestinians. Yet however long and crooked the path to real peace may prove to be, we must be clear that we will never allow anyone in the Middle East to choose terrorism as a method of diplomacy.

Israel is making progress toward returning the region to some degree of normalcy.

America must continue to stand firm in its support of Israel in her time of need. Our thoughts and prayers are with the Israeli people, and with all who are committed to a just, lasting and permanent peace of freedom, security, and liberty for all in the region.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the

gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS).

(Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is far from perfect; however, in the context of an ongoing peace seeking process, this reaffirmation of America's bond with Israel is a vital step forward. God has blessed America. We are the only remaining superpower in the world. We, the people of the United States, alone have the capacity to serve as the Great Angels of the 21st Century. We can lead the way to solve the most intractable problems. The fullest possible engagement in the Mid East is now a necessity. We must now go the final mile and offer all the resources that we can muster to encourage peace. The whole world knows the self-evident truth that in our hearts and souls we are wedded to Israel. There is no formal treaty that states the obvious; however, it is understood that a threat to the survival of Israel is a threat to a piece of America. We are brothers and sisters for democracy; for freedom; for equality; for the equal treatment of both genders; for recognition and respect for all races, religions and creeds. Against the overwhelming residue of oppressive governance throughout the world, America and Israel are leaders for enlightenment and liberating progress. Who among us, if forced to make the choice, would not want his children to live in the State of Israel, instead of any one of the despotic, oppressive surrounding Mid East nations. Our world has been plunged into a war against more than terrorism. We are in a war against technologically advanced barbarism. We, too, have a tradition that believes in martyrdom, but it is not based on the reckless courage of murderers. The Christians who met Nero's lions were martyrs; the followers of Ghandhi were martyrs; the slain American civil rights freedom fighters were martyrs; suffering 27 years in prison, Nelson Mandela emerged as a martyr and invited three of his prison guards to dine with him at the presidential inauguration banquet. There are millions of us who are determined to continue the fight for justice for all. But the martyrdom of suicide bombers will never bring freedom and justice. And peace can never be achieved merely with tanks and guns. "War never leaves us thrilled/ But maniacs demand to be killed." After we have blocked the murders of the maniacs, we must then go on to take the greatest risk. America must dare to exert a total pressure for peace. We must take the greatest risk of all. The Great Angels of America must be willing to support a formal treaty which guarantees defensible borders for Israel and guarantees an independent Palestinian state. No troops will be necessary to accomplish this feat. Our overwhelming moral force is adequate. We must just state this goal, set a deadline and make peace a reality. We shall overcome.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close for my side. It has been a good debate. The bottom line is, Israel is a democracy and Israel is our friend, and Israel is our ally in the global war against terrorism.

In our war against Iraq 10 years ago, Israel stood with us. In our war against

terrorism today, Israel is standing with us. In turn, we must stand with Israel in its war against terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, it is particularly important that we adopt this resolution now at a time when Israel is subject to a vicious chorus of blind and bigoted hate. Our friends in Israel must be assured that they are not alone in facing the terrorist onslaught. We must make clear that there is no moral equivalence between terrorism and self-defense.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to rise to the occasion and show our strong solidarity with the democratic state of Israel in our shared struggle against terrorism.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from West Virginia seek to use his additional minute and a half?

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

Again, I say that there are other approaches and more balanced approaches that we can take that would further the cause of peace and that would further American interests in the region and certainly do this Congress a great deal more credibility. I do notice the main sponsor of the resolution has just walked on to the floor, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), and I want to commend him for the last 2 sentences that he finally put in his resolution, urging all parties to pursue and establish a just and lasting and comprehensive peace in the Middle East, which I believe is only the second time in the whole resolution where the word "peace" was used, but nevertheless he finally got around to that. Then he did mention the suffering and the humanitarian needs of the Palestinian people in the very last line, and I appreciate that.

I would ask him as he gets ready to close if he would also agree to the inclusion in his resolution of a line which, as President Bush has stated, recognizing the Palestinian state alongside an Israeli state.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the distinguished whip.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his work on this resolution and his indulgence and his stature, and I appreciate his support. I also thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the ranking member on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for his incredible courage and principle in co-authoring this resolution, and I appreciate his friendship.

Mr. Speaker, these are very serious times. The principles and virtues that all of us revere and respect about America are under assault today in the Middle East. The people of Israel are

resisting a wave of terrorism. As we watch that violence directed against Israel, we are roused to resolve that terrorism, in all its forms, has to be defeated. There is no moral equivalence, there is no moral equivalence between a democratic government defending its citizens and a calculated strategy of death waged by terrorist organizations.

Homicide bombings are evil incarnate. On the scales of justice and morality, they are no different from the attacks launched against the United States just last September. They serve only to satisfy the gruesome appetites of pure hatred and unrestrained wickedness, and they demonstrate beyond question that the abiding threat to peace in the Middle East stems from the groups which exist for the single purpose of destroying Israel.

The citizens of free nations share a very special bond. It flows from our common commitment to a set of enduring principles. We trust democracy. We defend human rights. We live under the rule of law, and we seek good relations with every country wishing to co-exist peacefully with other countries. Israel is the lone bastion of freedom in the region. Within Israel's own neighbors, peaceful transitions are nothing more than accidents of fate. Describing these countries as genuine democracies would be as inaccurate as calling an acorn an oak tree.

It is time for every country in the Middle East to pass a fundamental test of a civilized world by unequivocally rejecting terrorism and acknowledging that bombings and other acts of terror render any underlying cause of terror or grievance illegitimate. Mr. Speaker, it is the test that President Bush laid down in this Chamber, right here, when he said, you are either with us or you are with the terrorists.

The men and women of Israel must know that we recognize the broader significance of this struggle, that the attacks directed against Israel are attacks against liberty, and all free people must recognize that Israel's fight is our fight. Let every terrorist know that the American people will never abandon freedom, democracy, or Israel. America will never permit the Jewish state to fall to aggression.

The search for peace cannot diminish and must not obscure the very key lessons of the past 40 years. Democracies must never negotiate with terrorists. And for that reason, Yasir Arafat strikes many of us as a highly unreliable vessel to carry the hope for peace. To turn from his past, it would be very difficult for him to do. The most promising sign for both the people of Israel and the Palestinian people would be the emergence of a moderate Palestinian leader who truly seeks a negotiated settlement for lasting peace. The United States cannot be a broker between one party that wants peace and the other party that wants terrorism. It cannot succeed. It has not succeeded. The peace process has been a failure for over 25 years. Today, the

Palestinian men and women who wish nothing more than just to raise their family in peace have no voice. In fact, they are killed if they raise their head of moderation. Nothing will do more to bring peace to this region than the emergence of a Palestinian leader with the courage and support of the United States to accept Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state and a willingness to acknowledge Israel's legitimate security considerations. But until that day comes, every man and woman in Israel should know that they do not stand alone, because America stands with them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 392, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 352, noes 21, answered “present” 29, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 126]

AYES—352

Ackerman	Clay	Foley
Aderholt	Clement	Forbes
Akin	Clyburn	Ford
Allen	Coble	Fossella
Andrews	Collins	Frank
Armey	Combest	Frelinghuysen
Baca	Costello	Frost
Bachus	Cox	Gallegly
Baird	Coyne	Ganske
Baker	Cramer	Gekas
Baldacci	Crenshaw	Gephardt
Ballenger	Crowley	Gibbons
Barcia	Cubin	Gilchrest
Barrett	Culberson	Gillmor
Bartlett	Cummings	Gilman
Barton	Cunningham	Gonzalez
Bass	Davis (CA)	Goode
Bentsen	Davis (FL)	Goodlatte
Berkley	Davis (IL)	Gordon
Berman	Davis, Jo Ann	Goss
Berry	Davis, Tom	Graham
Biggert	Deal	Granger
Blagojevich	DeGette	Graves
Blumenauer	Delahunt	Green (TX)
Blunt	DeLauro	Green (WI)
Boehlert	DeLay	Greenwood
Boehner	DeMint	Grucci
Bonilla	Deutsch	Gutierrez
Bono	Diaz-Balart	Gutknecht
Boozman	Dicks	Hall (OH)
Borski	Doggett	Hall (TX)
Boswell	Doolittle	Hansen
Boyd	Doyle	Harman
Brady (PA)	Dreier	Hart
Brady (TX)	Duncan	Hastings (FL)
Brown (SC)	Dunn	Hastings (WA)
Bryant	Edwards	Hayes
Burr	Ehlers	Hayworth
Buyer	Ehrlich	Hefley
Calvert	Emerson	Herger
Camp	Engel	Hill
Capito	English	Hilleary
Capps	Eshoo	Hinchey
Cardin	Etheridge	Hinojosa
Carson (IN)	Evans	Hobson
Carson (OK)	Ferguson	Hoefel
Castle	Filner	Holden
Chabot	Flake	Holt
Chambliss	Fletcher	Honda

Horn	Meeks (NY)	Serrano
Houghton	Menendez	Sessions
Hoyer	Mica	Shadegg
Hulshof	Miller, Dan	Shaw
Hunter	Miller, Gary	Shays
Hyde	Miller, Jeff	Sherman
Isakson	Moore	Sherwood
Israel	Moran (KS)	Shimkus
Issa	Morella	Shows
Jackson-Lee	Myrick	Shuster
(TX)	Nadler	Simmons
Johnson (CT)	Napolitano	Simpson
Johnson (IL)	Neal	Skeen
Johnson, E. B.	Nethercutt	Skelton
Johnson, Sam	Ney	Slaughter
Jones (NC)	Northup	Smith (NJ)
Kanjorski	Norwood	Smith (TX)
Keller	Nussle	Smith (WA)
Kelly	Olver	Snyder
Kennedy (MN)	Ortiz	Souder
Kennedy (RI)	Osborne	Spratt
Kerns	Ose	Stearns
Kildee	Otter	Strickland
King (NY)	Owens	Stump
Kingston	Pallone	Stupak
Kirk	Pascarell	Sununu
Knollenberg	Pastor	Sweeney
Kolbe	Pelosi	Tancredo
LaFalce	Pence	Tanner
LaHood	Peterson (PA)	Tauscher
Lampson	Phelps	Tauzin
Langevin	Pickering	Taylor (MS)
Lantos	Pitts	Terry
Larsen (WA)	Platts	Thomas
Larson (CT)	Pombo	Thornberry
Latham	Pomeroy	Thune
LaTourette	Portman	Tiahrt
Leach	Price (NC)	Tiberi
Levin	Pryce (OH)	Tierney
Lewis (CA)	Putnam	Toomey
Lewis (GA)	Quinn	Towns
Lewis (KY)	Radanovich	Turner
Linder	Ramstad	Udall (CO)
Lipinski	Rangel	Udall (NM)
LoBiondo	Regula	Upton
Lofgren	Rehberg	Velazquez
Lowey	Reyes	Visclosky
Lucas (KY)	Reynolds	Vitter
Lucas (OK)	Rodriguez	Walden
Luther	Roemer	Walsh
Lynch	Rogers (KY)	Waters
Maloney (CT)	Rogers (MI)	Watkins (OK)
Maloney (NY)	Ross	Watson (CA)
Manzullo	Rothman	Watts (OK)
Markey	Roybal-Allard	Waxman
Mascara	Royce	Weiner
Matheson	Rush	Weldon (FL)
Matsui	Ryan (WI)	Weldon (PA)
McCarthy (MO)	Ryun (KS)	Weller
McCarthy (NY)	Sanchez	Wexler
McCollum	Sandlin	Whitfield
McCrery	Sawyer	Wicker
McGovern	Saxton	Wilson (NM)
McInnis	Schaffer	Wilson (SC)
McIntyre	Schakowsky	Wolf
McKeon	Schiff	Wu
McNulty	Schrock	Wynn
Meehan	Scott	Young (AK)
Meek (FL)	Sensenbrenner	

NOES—21

Abercrombie	Hilliard	Obey
Bonior	Inlee	Paul
Boucher	Jackson (IL)	Petri
Condit	Klecza	Rahall
Conyers	Lee	Rohrabacher
DeFazio	McKinney	Smith (MI)
Dingell	Miller, George	Stark

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—29

Baldwin	Kaptur	Peterson (MN)
Barr	Kilpatrick	Rivers
Becerra	Kind (WI)	Sabo
Bishop	Kucinich	Sanders
Brown (OH)	McDermott	Solis
Capuano	Mink	Thompson (CA)
Clayton	Mollohan	Thurman
Farr	Moran (VA)	Watt (NC)
Hostettler	Oberstar	Woolsey
Jones (OH)	Payne	

NOT VOTING—32

Bereuter	Cooksey	Istook
Bilirakis	Crane	Jefferson
Brown (FL)	Dooley	Jenkins
Burton	Everett	John
Callahan	Fattah	McHugh
Cannon	Hoekstra	Millender-
Cantor	Hoolley	McDonald

Murtha
Oxley
Riley
Ros-Lehtinen

Roukema
Stenholm
Sullivan
Taylor (NC)

Thompson (MS)
Trafigant
Wamp
Young (FL)

□ 1653

Mr. WELLER changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

Ms. KILPATRICK and Mr. MORAN of Virginia changed their vote from "no" to "present."

Mr. MOLLOHAN changed his vote from "aye" to "present."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, due to district business, I was unable to cast a vote for H. Res. 392 to express solidarity with Israel in its fight against terrorism. Had I been present for the vote, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, due to illness, I was unable to vote during the following roll-call votes. Had I been present, I would have voted as indicated below.

Rollcall No. 124 (H. Res. 404, on ordering the previous question)—"yes."

Rollcall No. 125 (H. Res. 404, on agreeing to the resolution)—"yes."

Rollcall No. 126 (H. Res. 392, on motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, as amended)—"yes."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 392, the resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time to inquire as to the schedule for next week, and I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to respond to the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the House has completed its legislative business for the week. The House will meet next for legislative business on Tuesday, May 7 at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. On Tuesday, the majority leader will schedule a number of measures under suspension

of the rules, a list of which will be distributed to the Members' offices tomorrow. Recorded votes on Tuesday will be postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday and the balance of the week, the majority leader has scheduled the following measures: H.J. Res. 87, the Yucca Mountain Repository Site Approval Act; H.J. Res. 84, a resolution disapproving the action taken by the President under section 203 of the Trade Act of 1974; and H.R. 4547, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Ms. PELOSI. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to seek further clarification from the gentleman.

Can I detect from your comments that there will be no votes on Friday for sure?

Mr. BLUNT. There probably will be votes on Friday since we are starting the DOD authorization on Thursday. It is likely that will go to Friday and, of course, on Friday we would have our final votes completed by 2 o'clock.

Ms. PELOSI. Again, seeking further clarification, H.J. Res. 87, the Yucca Mountain Repository Approval Act, can the gentleman be more specific about which day that will be coming up?

Mr. BLUNT. Expect that measure to come to the floor on Wednesday.

Ms. PELOSI. And the resolution disapproving the actions taken by the President under 203 of the Trade Act?

Mr. BLUNT. We expect that to be on the floor on Wednesday as well.

Ms. PELOSI. And the defense authorization the gentleman said will be Thursday?

Mr. BLUNT. Start on Thursday and anticipate that we are very likely to carrying over to Friday. And this will be, of course, the first Friday that we will have worked, and perhaps have been scheduled to work, will be this Friday.

Ms. PELOSI. Will the gentleman also shed some light on when you think the welfare reform bill will be considered on the floor?

Mr. BLUNT. The Committee on Energy and Commerce marked up the bill last week. The Committee on Education and the Workforce and the Committee on Ways and Means will do their markup this week. It is likely that we will have the welfare reform bill the week after next.

Ms. PELOSI. Does the gentleman have any idea when the supplemental will be brought to the floor?

Mr. BLUNT. We are working with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), and I think it is possible that the committee could mark up the supplemental next week; and we will move it to the floor as quickly as possible after it is marked up.

Ms. PELOSI. Do you anticipate that being next week or the week after?

Mr. BLUNT. We anticipate the committee could do the markup next week, and we will look for the earliest pos-

sible floor time; but that certainly could be the week after it is marked up.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for the information.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 6, 2002

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Friday, May 3, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

HOOR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, MAY 7, 2002

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, May 6, 2002, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, May 7, 2002 for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

HOOR OF MEETING THURSDAY, MAY 9, 2002

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Wednesday, May 8, 2002, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. on Thursday, May 9, 2002, for the purpose of receiving in this Chamber former Members of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON THURSDAY, MAY 9, 2002, FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECEIVING FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Thursday, May 9, 2002, for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair for the purpose of receiving in this Chamber former Members of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCIAL COUNSELING OF THE OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Jacqueline Aamot, Director of Financial Counseling, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 24, 2002.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington,
DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena for testimony issued by the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

JACQUELINE AAMOT,
Director of Financial Counseling.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HUMAN RESOURCES/OFFICE OF PAYROLL SUPERVISOR OF THE OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Christine A. Baptiste, Human Resources/Office of Payroll Supervisor, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, April 29, 2002.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena for testimony issued by the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

CHRISTINE A. BAPTISTE,
Supervisor, Human Resources/
Office of Payroll.

DISPLAYING THE TEN
COMMANDMENTS

(Mr. KERNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KERNS. Mr. Speaker, on this National Day of Prayer, citizens all across our great Nation will gather to give thanks to our Father in heaven for the blessings we have received and to ask humbly for His mercy.

On this day it is important that we recognize the role faith and religion plays in our Nation from its founding to the present day.

The Ten Commandments have been fundamental to the development of the basic legal principles of western civilization and our Nation. They have set forth a code of moral conduct that promises respect for our system of laws and the general good of society. Considering the positive influence they have had in our Nation, I believe we should proudly display the Ten Commandments and recognize the contributions they have made to the United States.

□ 1700

While some would have them removed all religious references from the public square, the historical facts cannot be ignored. There are liberal organizations that have twisted the first amendment and use the threat of costly lawsuits to restrict religious expression in our Nation. In the face of this pressure, we must stand together and work to reverse this trend.

In Montgomery County, Indiana, one individual with the support of the Indiana Civil Liberties Union based the threat of a lawsuit to have the Ten Commandments removed from the courthouse square. I found that alarming. In fact, it was a motivating factor for this legislation I wrote and introduced to require the display of the Ten Commandments here in the United States Capitol.

Our legislation has 31 cosponsors, and that is 31 Members of Congress. We are gaining support. On this National Day of Prayer, Mr. Speaker, I ask that we pray for our Nation, and we continue to have respect for our God.

NATIONAL DAY OF PRAYER

(Mr. ADERHOLT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I too want to rise this afternoon to recognize today as the National Day of Prayer. National Days of Prayer have been observed for several years in accordance with Public Law 100-307. Mr. Speaker, I cannot remember a day or a year that today has meant more for this Nation. The heart of our Nation was wounded on September 11, but this wound has begun to heal through the ceaseless prayers of the people.

We pray today for the continued grace of God upon our land. We pray for the safety of our men and women of the Armed Forces, many of whom are fighting across the sea in the war on terrorism, and we pray for peace throughout the world.

We also pray for wisdom and guidance for this body here in the United States House of Representatives, for the Senate, for the judiciary, for the President and also his administration. Great tasks and heavy responsibilities

lay upon our shoulders. Whether making decisions about the Middle East or international situations or policies for our own country, we pray that we do not rely on our own knowledge, but on the wisdom of God.

Mr. Speaker, today, all across America, individuals are meeting in courthouses, city halls, State houses and here on Capitol Hill, to observe this National Day of Prayer. Since 9 o'clock this morning at the Cannon House Office Building right across the street, hundreds of individuals have assembled together for that purpose, as one Nation, under God, and indivisible.

HONORING ARKANSAN WWII POW'S
AND THEIR RUSSIAN COUNTER-
PARTS

(Mr. BOOZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize three World War II POW veterans from the State of Arkansas who will be leaving this Sunday, May 5, to participate in an historic reunion with Russian World War II veterans in Volgograd, Russia.

In 1945 Silas LeGrow, Thomas Watt Bonds and Charley Stringer were liberated by Russian soldiers from POW camps in Manchuria, Germany and Romania respectively. Upon release, their Russian allies shared limited food rations, clothing and medical supplies to keep them alive. Without this generosity, our soldiers would have come much closer to death.

This week these men will travel to Volgograd to thank their Russian colleagues for saving their lives and enabling them to return home to their families in Arkansas. They will also celebrate Russia's Victory Day in Volgograd, which was known as Stalingrad in the Soviet era. World War II's bloodiest battle on Russian soil took place in Stalingrad, and so the celebration of Victory Day is of great significance to the local residents.

I would also like to recognize the University of Arkansas Medical School for their part in making the trip for these veterans a reality. In 1993, UMS formed a partnership with Volgograd Medical Academy, and this relationship resulted in the establishment of a Russian family medical department, a family medicine residency program and tuberculosis program. It is through this partnership that the city of Volgograd thoughtfully extended an invitation to the World War II POWs from Arkansas to join in the Victory Day festivities.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of this display of international friendship and remembrance by representatives from my home State. Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to recognize them.

MARTIN AND GRACIA BURNHAM

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 341st day that Martin and Gracia Burnham have been held captive by Muslim terrorists in the Philippines.

Unfortunately, I have disturbing news to report today. According to a report in the Associated Press, the Abu Sayyaf group that is holding the Burnhams hostage is no longer interested in negotiations and has threatened to kill Martin and Gracia. "The door is closed for negotiations. It is up to them if they want to look for the dead bodies," terrorist leader Abu Sabaya chillingly stated in a radio interview. Apparently now the ASG is more interested in embarrassing the Philippine and American governments and military than their own supposed political demands.

The Abu Sayyaf will not succeed in embarrassing us, for we will not back down in the face of terrorism. President Bush has committed our resources to rooting out the terrorism around the world. The Philippine government has been working with us to combat terrorism in their own nation. I am confident that we will eliminate the Abu Sayyaf and other evil organizations, and I pray that the Burnham family will soon be reunited.

At this crucial time, I ask my colleagues to join me in prayer for Martin and Gracia and their loved ones that this nightmare may soon be over.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISSA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

REVISIONS TO ALLOCATION FOR HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD revisions to the 302(a) allocations and budgetary aggregates established by H. Con. Res. 83, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2002. My authority to make these adjustments is derived from Sec. 314 of the Congressional Budget Act and Sec. 221(c) of H. Con. Res. 83.

H.R. 3090, the Job Creation and Worker Assistance Act of 2002 (P.L. 107-147), contained emergency-designated direct spending. The emergency-designated direct spending increases the 302(a) allocation to the House Ways and Means Committee and the budgetary aggregates by \$5,984,000,000 in new budget authority and \$5,755,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002 and \$5,464,000,000

in new budget authority and \$5,675,000,000 in outlays for the total of fiscal years 2002 through 2006.

Those adjustments increase the 302(a) allocation to the House Ways and Means Committee to \$7,344,000,000 in new budget authority and \$6,655,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002 and \$20,873,000,000 in new budget authority and \$20,744,000,000 in outlays for the total of fiscal years 2002 through 2006. The budgetary aggregates for fiscal year 2002 are increased to \$1,679,172,000,000 in new budget authority and \$1,644,607,000,000 in outlays.

Questions may be directed to Dan Kowalski at 67270.

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2002 AND THE 5-YEAR PERIOD FY 2002 THROUGH FY 2006

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, to facilitate the application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act and section 201 of the conference report accompanying H. Con. Res. 83, I am transmitting a status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 2002 and for the five-year period of fiscal years 2002 through 2006. This status report is current through April 30, 2002.

The term "current level" refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature.

The first table in the report compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the aggregate levels set forth by H. Con. Res. 83. This comparison is needed to enforce section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 2002 because appropriations for those years have not yet been considered.

The second table compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays for discretionary action by each authorizing committee with the "section 302(a)" allocations made under H. Con. Res. 83 for fiscal year 2002 and fiscal years 2002 through 2006. "Discretionary action" refers to legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2002 with the "section 302(b)" suballocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. The comparison is also needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act because the point of order under that section equally applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) suballocation.

The fourth table gives the current level for 2003 of accounts identified for advance appropriations in the statement of managers accom-

panying H. Con. Res. 83. This list is needed to enforce section 201 of the budget resolution, which creates a point of order against appropriation bills that contain advance appropriations that are: (i) not identified in the statement of managers or (ii) would cause the aggregate amount of such appropriations to exceed the level specified in the resolution.

The fifth table compares discretionary appropriations to the levels provided by section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985. If at the end of a session discretionary spending in any category exceeds the limits set forth in section 251(c) (as adjusted pursuant to section 251(b)), a sequestration of amounts within that category is automatically triggered to bring spending within the established limits. As the determination of the need for a sequestration is based on the report of the President required by section 254, this table is provided for informational purposes only.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET—STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2002 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN H. CON. RES. 83

(Reflecting Action Completed as of April 30, 2002 (On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars))

	Fiscal year 2002	Fiscal years 2002–2003
Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	1,679,172	n.a.
Outlays	1,644,607	n.a.
Revenues	1,638,202	8,878,506
Current Level:		
Budget Authority	1,670,534	n.a.
Outlays	1,631,627	n.a.
Revenues	1,629,592	8,790,551
Current Level over (+)/under (–) Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	–8,638	n.a.
Outlays	–12,980	n.a.
Revenues	–8,610	–87,955

n.a.—Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2003 through 2006 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

Budget Authority: Enactment of measures providing new budget authority for FY 2002 in excess of \$8,638,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2002 budget authority to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 83.

Outlays: Enactment of measures providing new outlays for FY 2002 in excess of \$12,980,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2002 outlays to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 83.

Revenues: Enactment of measures that would result in revenue loss for FY 2002 in excess of \$8,610,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall further below the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 83.

Enactment of measures resulting in revenue loss for the period FY 2002 through 2006 in excess of \$87,955,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall further below the appropriate levels set by H. Con. Res. 83.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(A) ALLOCATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY ACTION

(Reflecting Action Completed as of April 30, 2002 (Fiscal Years, in millions of dollars))

House Committee	2002		2002–2006	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Agriculture:				
Allocation	7,350	7,350	28,492	25,860
Current Level	0	2	0	0
Difference	–7,350	–7,348	–28,492	–25,860
Armed Services:				
Allocation	146	146	398	398
Current Level	163	146	276	276
Difference	17	0	–122	–122

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(A) ALLOCATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY ACTION—Continued

[Reflecting Action Completed as of April 30, 2002 (Fiscal Years, in millions of dollars)]

House Committee	2002		2002–2006	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Banking and Financial Services:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	8	9	46	47
Difference	8	9	46	47
Education and the Workforce:				
Allocation	5	5	32	32
Current Level	–195	–180	3,785	3,040
Difference	–200	–185	3,753	3,008
Commerce:				
Allocation	2,687	2,687	–6,537	–6,537
Current Level	–46	–50	2	7
Difference	–2,733	–2,737	6,539	6,544
International Relations:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Government Reform:				
Allocation	0	0	–1,995	–1,995

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(A) ALLOCATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY ACTION—Continued

[Reflecting Action Completed as of April 30, 2002 (Fiscal Years, in millions of dollars)]

House Committee	2002		2002–2006	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Current Level	0	0	–4	–4
Difference	0	0	1,991	1,991
House Administration:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Resources:				
Allocation	0	–3	365	88
Current Level	0	–3	16	13
Difference	0	0	–349	–75
Judiciary:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	109	109	299	159
Difference	109	109	299	159
Small Business:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(A) ALLOCATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY ACTION—Continued

[Reflecting Action Completed as of April 30, 2002 (Fiscal Years, in millions of dollars)]

House Committee	2002		2002–2006	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Transportation and Infrastructure:				
Allocation	2,000	3,200	2,000	4,700
Current Level	3,108	4,308	9,949	12,649
Difference	1,108	1,108	7,949	7,949
Science:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Veterans' Affairs:				
Allocation	264	264	3,205	3,205
Current Level	230	230	3,097	3,097
Difference	–34	–34	–108	–108
Ways and Means:				
Allocation	7,344	6,655	20,873	20,744
Current Level	12,411	12,182	44,854	44,725
Difference	5,067	5,527	23,981	23,981

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE 302(b) SUBALLOCATIONS

[In millions of dollars]

Appropriations Subcommittee	Revised 302(b) suballocations as of September 20, 2001 (H. Rpt. 107–208)		Adjustments not reflected in 302(b) suballocations		Current level reflecting action completed as of April 30, 2002		Current level minus suballocations	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development	15,668	16,044	535	352	16,553	16,634	350	238
Commerce, Justice, State	38,541	38,905	2,423	1,032	41,079	39,879	115	–58
National Defense	299,860	293,941	20,743	17,340	320,603	311,898	0	617
District of Columbia	399	415	200	200	608	618	9	3
Energy & Water Development	23,705	24,218	574	346	25,170	25,116	891	552
Foreign Operations	15,167	15,087	50	13	15,396	15,119	179	19
Interior	18,941	17,800	488	353	19,208	18,081	–221	–72
Labor, HHS & Education	119,725	106,224	3,647	1,821	126,265	109,153	2,893	1,108
Legislative Branch	2,892	2,918	256	196	3,230	3,137	82	23
Military Construction	10,500	9,203	104	27	10,604	9,217	0	–13
Transportation ¹	14,892	53,817	1,296	777	16,596	54,742	408	148
Treasury-Postal Service	17,022	16,285	1,283	1,098	18,352	17,354	47	–29
VA-HUD-Independent Agencies	85,434	88,062	7,101	348	92,335	88,811	–200	401
Unassigned ²	0	0	4,554	21,132	0	13,397	–4,554	–7,735
Grand Total	662,746	682,919	43,254	45,035	705,999	723,156	–1	–4,798

¹ Does not include mass transit BA.² Reflects 2002 outlays for FY2001 appropriations contained in P.L. 107–38, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Recovery from and Response to Terrorist Acts on the United States, and budget authority and outlays that result from the increase in the statutory spending caps contained in P.L. 107–117, the bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2002.

STATEMENT OF FY2003 ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS UNDER SECTION 201 OF H. CON. RES. 83

[Reflecting Action Completed as of April 30, 2002 (in millions of dollars)]

	Budget authority
Appropriate Level	23,159
Current Level:	
Commerce, Justice, State Subcommittee:	
Patent and Trademark Office	0
Legal Activities and U.S. Marshals, Antitrust Division	0
U.S. Trustee System	0
Federal Trade Commission	0
Interior Subcommittee: Elk Hills	36
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee:	
Employment and Training Administration	2,463
Health Resources	0
Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program	0
Child Care Development Block Grant	0
Elementary and Secondary Education (reading excellence)	0
Education for the Disadvantaged	7,383
School Improvement	1,765
Children and Family Services (head start)	1,400
Special Education	5,072
Vocational and Adult Education	791
Treasury, General Government Subcommittee:	
Payment to Postal Service	48
Federal Building Fund	0
Veterans, Housing and Urban Development Subcommittee, Section 8 Renewals	4,200
Total	23,158
Current Level over (+)/under (–) Appropriate Level	–1

COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LEVELS SET FORTH IN SECTION 251(C) OF THE BALANCED BUDGET AND EMERGENCY DEFICIT CONTROL ACT OF 1985

[Reflecting Action Completed as of April 30, 2002 (in millions of dollars)]

	Statutory cap ¹	Current level	Current level over (+)/under (–) statutory cap
General Purpose:			
BA	704,548	704,241	–307
OT	696,092	687,940	–8,152
Defense ² :			
BA	n.a.	347,394	n.a.
OT	n.a.	347,440	n.a.
Nondefense ² :			
BA	n.a.	356,847	n.a.
OT	n.a.	340,500	n.a.
Highway Category:			
BA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
OT	28,489	28,489	0
Mass Transit Category:			
BA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
OT	5,275	5,275	0
Conservation Category:			
BA	1,735	1,758	23
OT	1,469	1,452	–17

¹ Established by OMB Sequestration Preview Report for Fiscal Year 2002.² Defense and nondefense categories are advisory rather than statutory. n.a. = Not applicable.U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2002.Hon. JIM NUSSLE,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2002 budget and is current

through April 30, 2002. The report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of H. Con. Res. 83, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2002. The budget resolution figures incorporate revisions submitted by the Committee on the Budget to the House to reflect funding for emergency requirements, disability reviews Earned Income Tax Credit compliance initiative, and adoption assistance. These revisions are required by section 314 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended. In addition, section 218 of H. Con. Res. 83 provides for an allocation increase to accommodate House action on the President's revised request for defense spending, and Public Law 107–117 contains language that increases the discretionary spending limits for fiscal year 2002.

Since my last letter, dated February 5, 2002, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the Job Creation and Worker Assistance Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–147), which has changed budget authority, outlays, and revenues for 2002.

Sincerely,
BARRY B. ANDERSON
(For Dan L. Crippen, Director).

Enclosure.

FISCAL YEAR 2002 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT AS OF APRIL 30, 2002

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget au- thority	Outlays	Revenues
Enacted in previous sessions:			
Revenues	0	0	1,672,118
Permanents and other spending legislation	994,555	945,695	0
Appropriation legislation	1,011,996	1,000,944	0
Offsetting receipts	- 322,403	- 322,403	0
Total, enacted in previous sessions	1,684,148	1,624,236	1,672,118
Action this session:			
An act to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish fixed interest rates (P.L. 107-139)	- 195	- 180	0
Job Creation and Worker Assistance Act of 2002 (P.L. 107-147)	5,984	5,755	- 42,526
Total, action this session	5,789	5,575	- 42,526
Entitlements and mandatories: Difference between enacted levels and budget resolution estimates for appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	- 18,054	1,816	0
Total Current Level	1,670,534	1,631,627	1,629,592
Total Budget Resolution	1,679,172	1,644,607	1,638,202
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	0	0	0
Current Level Under Budget Resolution	- 8,638	- 12,980	- 8,610
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2002-2006:			
House Current Level	0	0	8,790,551
House Budget Resolution	0	0	8,878,506
Current Level Under Budget Resolution	0	0	- 87,955

Notes: P.L. = Public Law. Section 314 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, requires that the House Budget Committee revise the budget resolution to reflect funding provided in bills reported by the House for emergency requirements, disability reviews, an Earned Income Tax Credit compliance initiative, and adoption assistance. In addition, Section 218 of H. Con. Res. 83 provides for an allocation increase to accommodate House action on the President's revised request for defense spending. Public Law 107-117 contains language that increases the discretionary spending limits for fiscal year 2002, and Public Law 107-147 revises budget authority and outlay allocations to accommodate emergency spending. To date, the Budget Committee has increased the budget authority allocation in the budget resolution by \$52,684 million and the outlay allocation by \$54,133 million for these purposes.

For comparability purposes, current level budget authority excludes \$1,349 million that was appropriated for mass transit. The budget authority for mass transit, which is exempt from the allocations made for the discretionary categories pursuant to sections 302(a)(1) and 302(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act, is not included in H. Con. Res. 83. Total budget authority including mass transit is \$1,671,883 million.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. INSLEE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. RUSH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues well know, just a few hours ago this body engaged in what I have heard many Members say was an enormously deliberative debate about the position the United States would take with Israel. I have even heard some of my junior Members suggesting that there was not enough time for us to engage in a more thorough debate to explain to the American

people the heartfelt positions that many of us have.

I was in that category. Because of the need to confine our remarks to a certain period of time, I felt compelled to share with my colleagues the road map that I think is imperative that we try and follow, away from any accusations or suggestions that the heartfelt, conscience-felt positions that many Members express are any less than any others.

I think it is important to note that this Nation has a long standing history that cannot be changed of being a very close friend of Israel. It is a friendship born out of the recognition of our own commitment, our mutual commitment to democracy. It is a blessing from the perspective that the United States is a mosaic. We come from the continent of Africa. We come from South America. We come from the Mideast, both Muslim and Jew. We come from many, many places, and therefore, it is by this reason that there is a great interest in this Nation about the various issues that abound in the world because so many of us come from different places.

It is for this reason that I would hope that the resolution offered today does not start any of us away from the ultimate goal. It is the preservation of our good friend Israel, but it is the recognition, as I said in my remarks, of the humanity and dignity of the Palestinian people, and as well, recognizing the value of the Palestinian State.

I would like to address this question of whether this message of a resolution should, in fact, put a spear in the peace process. Mr. Speaker, these are only words. Words cannot keep anyone who is committed to the peace process away from the peace table. That goes for the United States, that goes for Mr. Sharon, and it goes for Mr. Arafat.

I would say to the President that if all of us had had our wishes, we would have been involved in this process starting early on, but now we are at a

point where the involvement is crucial. I think the participation of Mr. Bush is vital, and I would encourage him to continue that participation.

I believe Secretary Powell should return, and as we return him back to the Mideast, I would encourage the Nation to give him our full support in the position of Secretary of State.

I would offer to say that many times we have utilized past Presidents, and I would encourage the utilization of past Presidents. Let me cite as an example, I am not from Ireland, but I have had the pleasure of being engaged in the peace process in a limited fashion as a Member of Congress and remember traveling with the former chairman of the International Relations Committee the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), making sure that we went to every single component of that whole process, meeting Gerry Adams and the unionists, and I cannot call all the names, but we were in southern Ireland and Northern Ireland. We did not leave until we met with every single component. We did not want anyone to believe they were not important.

That is what I think our challenge is after this resolution. I do not want the words of this resolution to completely cause us to move away from peace.

Let me bring to the attention of my colleagues, maybe they are not recognizing that the language in the resolution says in particular, among other things, it urges all parties in the region, all parties in the region, to pursue vigorously efforts to establish a just, lasting and comprehensive peace in the Middle East. It does not leave out Chairman Arafat. It does not leave out Prime Minister Sharon. It says everyone.

Then the resolution also specifically states it encourages the international community to take action to alleviate the humanitarian needs of the Palestinian people. I would expand that to help rebuild the structure of Palestine.

Let me again say, as I did on the floor of the House, my great admiration for many of the leaders of Israel, my great admiration for many of those who seek peace in the Mideast, but for Prime Minister Rabin, let me just simply say, as I quote Prime Minister Rabin, in 1994, Mr. Speaker, cited Mr. Arafat as a good friend and accepted him as a person who believed in peace. Where is Mr. Arafat in this day and time?

Let me conclude with these words, and these are words to Prime Minister Sharon and Chairman Arafat. "We will pursue the course of peace with determination and fortitude. We will not let up. We will not give in. Peace will triumph over all its enemies because the alternative is grimmer for us all. And we will prevail." These are the words of former Prime Minister Rabin, the man who understood war and understood peace at Oslo in 1994, receiving the Nobel Peace Prize. We will prevail if we can assure that we will all go to the peace table without question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MINK addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

NATIONAL BREAST CANCER COALITION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, recently I was visited here in Washington by the Maryland Chapter of the National Breast Cancer Coalition. Their message was very simple. This year alone, more than 225,000 women will be diagnosed with breast cancer, and more than 40,000 women will die from this terrible disease.

Despite these statistics, we still do not know what causes breast cancer, how to prevent it, or how to treat it effectively. The National Breast Cancer Coalition needs our help in moving towards their goal of eradicating this dreadful disease.

□ 1715

I want to add that combining all age groups, Caucasian women are more likely to develop breast cancer than African-American women. However, African-American women are more likely to die of breast cancer. Past studies show that nearly half, 47 percent, of all African-American women diagnosed with invasive breast cancer die from the disease within 10 years.

I come to the floor today with two questions: What can we do to end the suffering and needless loss of life, and what can Congress do?

What can we do? Individually we need to make sure our loved ones,

friends, family and coworkers have an annual mammogram and perform a monthly self-breast examination. Today, there is no cure. So prevention is the answer. I do not care how you get them to the examination room, beg or plead, but it must be done. Life is precious. Save a life by encouraging yearly mammograms and monthly self-breast exams.

What can we do as Members of Congress? There is legislation that is pending in committees that needs to be enacted and enacted now. Every day more women are diagnosed with cancer. Every day women are dying from the disease. I urge, no, I beg my colleagues to support and ensure that legislation is passed in this session that will lead to a cure for breast cancer. In the meantime, I beg my colleagues to help those who will develop or have breast cancer by providing medication for breast cancer.

Specifically what can we do? We must enact H.R. 1624, the Access to Cancer Therapies Act. This bill would provide Medicare coverage of oral anti-cancer drugs. This legislation extends coverage for all cancer drugs, whether it is oral or injectable.

What can we do? We must enact H.R. 1723, the Breast Cancer and Environmental Research Act. It is generally believed that our environment plays a role in the development of breast cancer. The extent of its role is uncertain. This bill would make grants for multi-institutional and multi-discipline research centers to study the links between the environment and breast cancer.

What can we do? We must provide \$175 million in the fiscal year 2003 Department of Defense appropriations for their Peer-Reviewed Breast Cancer Research Programs. Since 1992, this program has brought clinical trials into community settings, provided training and recruitment awards to doctors and scientists, and given grants to further promising ideas that could lead to a cure. More than 90 percent of this funding goes directly to the funding of these grants.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we must enact H.R. 602, the Genetic Information Non-discrimination in Health Insurance and Employment Act. This bill prohibits health insurers and employers from discriminating based on genetic information. Passage of all these legislative measures would go a long way to help eradicate breast cancer in our lifetime.

SUDAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. TANCREDI. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate on this national day of prayer that we recognize the great gifts that we have been given and the great land in which we live and we give

thanks for it. It is also, I think, important for us to think about some places in the world that desperately need our prayers and our help, in a variety of ways, but certainly our prayers. It is appropriate that today we think about a place far away, quite remote, someplace that does not come to mind very often but should because of the horrendous conditions in which people are forced to live. The place I refer to today is Sudan.

We have often seen pictures like these. They are often presented on television as the basis of appeals for aid or for charity for people who are certainly less well off than we and who are in dire straits. The horrendous thing here in the Sudan is that these people, people of southern Sudan specifically, are suffering not just because of the vagaries of the weather and the difficulty with the terrain in that area of the country, the arid part of the nation in which many live. They are not really, in fact, dealing with that as their major problem. They are, in fact, starving to death, it is true. They are dying of diseases by the thousands. To date, 2 million have died over the course of the last 10 years as a result of a civil war that has been going on there. That war is really what has caused the great damage to the people and to the land and to the lives of literally millions upon millions of southern Sudanese.

So today I want to refocus the attention of this House on the plight of these people. We have in the past acted in this body and passed something called The Sudan Peace Act. It languishes in the Senate, as do other pieces of legislation. This one no one seems to care about. It does not have the high visibility, of course, of so many of the other things we do around here, and so no one seems to care. I hope today to bring to the attention of this body and to the people in this country the plight of these people in south Sudan and to once again help us focus on what we can do to help and why we should help.

To aid in that endeavor, I will turn to my colleague, a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), who has graciously agreed to come down here and discuss this issue. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman with a gentle heart from Colorado for yielding and giving me the honor of coming alongside and joining him in his effort to bring a forgotten part of the world before the American people.

Without flattering the gentleman, it would be important to state for the record that his efforts and the efforts of our colleague and friend Senator SAM BROWNBACK have almost singularly awakened the conscience of the people of the United States of America about the plight and the humanitarian crisis and the moral bankruptcy of the government of Sudan.

A few points before I yield back to my better in this. Those that are with us, Mr. Speaker, should understand there is simply a humanitarian crisis in Sudan that requires a response by the United States. There is a government of Sudan that simply cannot in demonstrable ways be trusted in these efforts and should not be coddled even in the name of advancing our interest in the war on terrorism.

On the humanitarian crisis, as the gentleman from Colorado said, Mr. Speaker, 2 million Sudanese people have died of war-related injuries in recent years, including disease and starvation. We Americans still grieve the mindless loss of some 6,000 lives on September 11, yet 2 million people have been lost both to the violence of war and the devastation of its aftermath, with another 4 million Sudanese being displaced.

The government of Sudan uses a divide-and-destroy strategy to pit southern ethnic groups one against another. They actually have attacked civilian food production and supplies using starvation as a weapon of destruction in their war. And the government of Sudan conducts regular slave raids on villages in the south, preying most especially on the Christian population in south Sudan.

It is also well documented that the government of Sudan uses oil revenues to support its oppression of the southern Sudanese, this according to the Committee on Conscience at the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum.

In an alarming scenario, Sudanese government helicopter gunships recently bombed a world food program site in the western Upper Nile, killing 17 civilians. A government that bombs food production facilities is a morally bankrupt government with which the United States cannot deal.

And if we needed more evidence, Mr. Speaker, a mid-level al Qaeda official was recently captured in Sudan and, of course, Osama bin Laden has in recent years taken refuge there. A clear connection exists between Sudan and extremist elements in our war on terrorism.

The commander of Sudan's popular defense force called on the Sudanese people to join a holy war with the Palestinian people and rid Jerusalem of its, in his words, Zionist filth. These are the words of the commander of Sudan's defense forces. The president of Sudan has called for training camps to be set up for this purpose as well. And following this announcement, hundreds of thousands of Sudanese marched in the streets of Khartoum chanting anti-Israel, anti-U.S. slogans and singing the praises of Osama bin Laden.

After a cease-fire was agreed upon, the government of Sudan still denied humanitarian access to 43 locations in southern Sudan. Prior to this, the government of Sudan banned flights to, on average, 25 locations. In other words, they have announced they will continue bombing but just prevent inter-

national observation by kicking out all NGOs.

While he has asked me not to mention his name, Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to serve a district where a church in a small rural town of my heartland Indiana district raised the funds and sent a mission group to Sudan to do nothing more than deliver an ultralight aircraft so the Christians in southern Sudan would be able to surveil approaching armaments preparing to bombard cities, as they do with longer-range weapons.

The Bible tells us, on this national day of prayer, Mr. Speaker, that "From everyone who has been given much, much will be demanded. From the one who has been entrusted with much, much more will be asked." The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDI) has responded to that call from his heart in leading the way in this institution for the development and the passage in this Congress of the Sudan Peace Act.

I have been privileged to join the gentleman from Colorado in drafting a letter urging action on the Sudan Peace Act and would urge all of my colleagues to join us and many other prominent Members of this institution who have already added their names to this correspondence, including the majority leader, the conference chairman, and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

Let me say the United States, Mr. Speaker, has been blessed with an abundance of material goods, authority, and moral conscience. We can no longer tolerate the government-funded and subsidized massacre of human life, nor can we, as a Nation that is pluralistic in its faith but dominated by both a heritage and a contemporary Christian population, neither can we as a government of so great a people, turn a blind eye and a deaf ear to the suffering of the magnitude in Sudan that, again I hasten to add, is not a humanitarian crisis, Mr. Speaker, that is borne of environmental collapse or of drought, but it is a humanitarian crisis that is the result of the oppression and the murder of hundreds of thousands and millions of innocent civilians by the government of Sudan.

It is almost difficult to speak those words and imagine a place that would be so correctly described as a hell on earth. Yet there are people there whose faith puts mine to shame. There are people there every day tending to the sick and caring for the homeless. So let us simply today urge our colleagues to join us in this effort to call for action.

Again, I am very humbled to be able to stand with the gentleman from Colorado in this cause and simply cannot help but feel, as we have said one to another, that of all the things that we debate on this blue and gold carpet, of all the things that we will have the privilege of being a part of in the year or years that we each of us have left in

this place, perhaps there will be nothing of greater significance in eternity than what we do for the least of these in the world.

□ 1730

The way we can in our own modest way in this institution steer the policy of the United States of America to a bright and moral compass that believes in human dignity and believes in human freedom and actually sets international policy in a way that expresses that belief, which I maintain is in the heart of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDI) for yielding and for calling this Special Order, and look forward to laboring with the gentleman as he continues his important work pressing for the passage of the Sudan Peace Act, and bringing the plight of these extraordinary people of the Sudan to the attention of this body.

Mr. TANCREDI. Mr. Speaker, I must say that listening to the gentleman helps recharge my batteries on the issue. I think that the gentleman has been, certainly flattering, but more than that, he has in a way that I could never have done, focused the attention of this body on an issue of, I think, monumental importance, and I thank the gentleman for his kind words.

I had the great privilege of going to the Sudan. Actually, it was the very first trip I ever took as a congressman. It was in 1999. Senator BROWNBACK and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), we were privileged to go to the Sudan. I did not know what I was going to see there. I was concerned about the conditions there, and our own safety, as a matter of fact. I have to admit that was of some concern to me. We were told that we should not go. The State Department sent cables to my home stating do not go there. We have no people that we will give you as support. You should not go. Some of these places are in an area that is actively involved with the war effort in the south. There are towns that are being bombed, so we cannot really say anything about your safety except that you will have very little security.

Under those conditions, I wondered how sage I was about actually making a decision to go on such a trip. But it was important to do. I felt moved to do it, and I was going with someone who had been there before. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), has been there several times and is another stalwart in support of our efforts on behalf of the Sudanese people, especially the people of the south. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) had been there several times.

What we saw was devastating in many ways because we could see the incredible obstacles that confront these people. There was a severe drought, but it was only exacerbated by the activities of the government of the north. People were being massacred and hospitals were being bombed and

schools were being invaded, and teachers and children shot and people were being rounded up, taken away, forced into slavery in the north. We think to ourselves and certainly we did on that trip, what can we possibly do about this? How can we possibly change the policies of our Nation, change the situation in a country so far away. Yet certainly I felt, and so did Senator BROWNBACK and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), felt compelled to do something.

I will never forget being in a town called Yei in the southern tip of Sudan, and there was a great confrontation just a few days before we got there. Armed confrontation. The place had been bombed many times. As we walked through that small town of maybe 1,000, maybe 2,000 people, we were immediately surrounded by hundreds of children. They kept pressing closer and closer to us, so close we could hardly move.

They kept saying something that I could not understand. Our guide interpreted. He said they said they are trying to get close to you because they assume if they get close to you, an American congressman, whoever is dropping bombs will not drop a bomb at that point in time. Of course I was hoping the same thing, that that would be the case, but I was hoping that there was something that I could do to stop that fear forever for them because the fear in their eyes and the hunger in their eyes, it is just a vision that no one can experience without coming away with a sincere desire to do something to help.

I also remember the last day I was there, it was spent in a small mud-sided facility with a grass and palm roof, and it was the local church which had been constructed in a place where there were over 30,000 refugees. This was actually just one of many small churches in this refugee center, and all of these people had been driven out of their homes in the north, the northern part of Sudan. Almost everyone had lost someone. Somewhere near 6,000 people died from the trek from the Nuba Mountains down to this particular village, almost all of them children, and yet they came together in this makeshift church and they began to sing the praises of Jesus Christ.

They were spirit-filled in a way I can tell Members I hardly see in the United States, and I am an evangelical Christian. It was almost miraculous to see these people with that expression of emotion and that much joy that they were expressing in that kind of a setting. As I say, almost everyone had lost someone. They were living in a foreign land, land that they could not farm. It was a life that any of us would probably find fruitless and perhaps hopeless, and they had hope, and that hope was in the Lord.

I remember thinking to myself and telling them, as a matter of fact, that I had been moved to come there because of something that had happened

in my church in Colorado about 4 or 5 years prior where I was witnessing a program that was done, it was called the Persecuted Church Around the World, and it focused on the Sudan. I was not in Congress at the time. I was not even thinking of running for Congress. A gentleman was in this position, and we assumed that he was going to be in that position for quite a long time. But I felt a need to do something. After many twists and turns, I ended up in the Congress, and I asked for the Committee on International Relations, and then I asked for the Subcommittee on Africa, and I ended up in Sudan in this church.

I said I want to tell you a story. It is only right that my trip to the Sudan ends in a church because it started in a church. I told them the story about hearing about their plight, and wanting to do something about it.

What was interesting to me, and what I told them in that church, was that I thought of course that I was doing something for them, to help the people in Sudan. In reality, of course, what had happened was God had done something to help me. He had done far more for me, and the trip did more than I could do for the people of Sudan. That is the way of God. It is intriguing, and certainly it inspires us.

I came back and we did introduce the Sudan Peace Act. It calls for a number of things, including an end to any sort of corporate participation in Sudan. We already banned corporate involvement in the United States, but our bill says any foreign corporation that goes in there would be delisted from the American stock exchanges, the New York and American Stock Exchange. This is a very significant step to take, and it is probably why the bill is languishing in the Senate because that is a major, major step. A lot of concerns have been expressed about the kind of precedent that it would set. Let me tell Members why we have to do that.

The war in the south, and I should back up and explain, it is in our interest, it is in the interests of the United States of America to bring this conflict to an end in Sudan. As the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) mentioned, the northern part of Sudan is an area where we have found in the past people like Osama bin Laden who have been given safe havens there. It is still a place where al Qaeda finds a respite. One was just found there not too long ago.

It is not in our interest to have this conflict ongoing in the south. It is in our interest to bring it to an end, and if that means the separation of the country into two parts, so be it. I used to think that perhaps we could do something to just simply stop the fighting and keep the country united, maybe under some sort of federalist system where there is some sort of autonomy for the south. But because of the many times that the government in Sudan, and I will refer to it as Khar-

toum has simply promised something but almost before the ink is dry on the promise, they have broken it. They are in the process now of pursuing the war in the south in a vigorous way, even though they promised that they would not.

They promised a cease-fire. They are funding this war through the revenues derived from an oil pipeline recently opened, and that is why we have to ask the corporate world to be aware of what they are doing in the Sudan, be aware of the fact that the revenues that are derived from the sale of the oil in Sudan, those revenues are going to the prosecution of the war. Without those revenues, this war may very well have come to an end, but now that money is used and can be used and is being used to purchase arms, to pay for troops, and to continue the persecution of the south.

□ 1745

Now, it is a complex situation. It is not just the fact that the south is Christian and the north is Muslim. It is the fact also, of course, that there is a different culture, different languages and different interests entirely for the two peoples of this nation. It may very well be that we are at that point where that nation has to split asunder and that the people of the south will be allowed to actually construct their own government and determine their own faith.

At any rate, the only step we can take, the only step open to us right now in this body, is to encourage Members of the other body to advance the bill, the Sudan Peace Act. Let us bring it to a vote. It has passed in both Houses. We are awaiting the appointment of a conference committee. That is all that is stopping us from actually taking the next step and doing something significant to bring peace to this troubled land. Let us appoint a conference committee.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISSA). The Chair must remind Members to avoid improper references to the Senate.

Remarks in debate may not urge Senate action or characterize Senate action or inaction.

Mr. TANCREDO. I thank the Speaker for his admonition.

This conference needs to be voted on by this House and by the whole body, and we need to do it as quickly as possible in order for us to bring some relief to the people who have suffered for so long.

As I say, it is in our interests, it is in this Nation's interests, to bring peace to this land and to deal directly with the issue of the kind of horror and devastation that has besieged it for so long and that has plagued it for so long. So I hope that we will do that soon.

As I say, on this National Day of Prayer, as we think about our own wonderful gifts that we have in this

Nation and the challenges that we have as a Nation, certainly as a result of actions in the Middle East, the activities in the Middle East and other places, there are challenges to the nation, but what is happening in Sudan is not just a challenge for us to look at in a foreign policy sense. It is a challenge to our own moral precepts. It is a challenge to who we are as a Nation, who we are as a people.

Can we make the time, even though so many other things are pressing upon us in this body, can we make the time to deal with one of the worst situations that exists anywhere on the planet? In fact, the Secretary of State described it almost exactly in that way in testimony in front of our committee as one of the worst situations that exists anywhere in the world.

Now, if that is the case, and I believe it to be, then does this not deserve our attention, our continued attention? If it is one of the worst situations that exists anywhere on the planet, does it not behoove us to do everything we can to bring this to an end and to help the people in this country begin to think about a new life in a new land?

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FATTAH (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of personal business.

Mr. JEFFERSON (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. MCHUGH (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today after 2:00 p.m. on account of official business.

Mrs. ROUKEMA (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of illness.

Mr. SULLIVAN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of official business.

Mr. EVERETT (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today after 1:30 p.m. on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. INSLEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RUSH, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, for 5 minutes, today.

The following Member (at the request of Mr. PENCE) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. NUSSLE, for 5 minutes, today. (The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker,

H.R. 169. An act to require that Federal agencies be accountable for violations of antidiscrimination and whistleblower protection laws to require that each Federal agency post quarterly on its public Web site, certain statistical data relating to Federal sector equal employment opportunity complaints filed with such agency; and for other purposes.

H.R. 495. An act to designate the Federal Building located in Charlotte Amalie, St. Thomas, United States Virgin Islands, as the "Ron de Lugo Federal Building".

H.R. 819. An act to designate the Federal Building located at 143 West Liberty Street, Medina, Ohio, as the "Donald J. Pease Federal Building".

H.R. 3093. An act to designate the Federal Building and United States courthouse located at 501 Bell Street in Alton, Illinois, as the "William L. Beatty Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

H.R. 3282. An act to designate the Federal Building and United States courthouse located at 400 North Main Street in Butte, Montana, as the "Mile Mansfield Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1094. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research, information, and education with respect to blood cancer.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 3, 2002, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6571. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Steam Treatment of olden Nematode-Infested Farm Equipment, Construction Equipment, and Containers [Docket No. 01-050-2] received April 29, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6572. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Citrus Canker Quarantined Areas; Technical Amendment [Docket No. 01-079-3] received April 29, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6573. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Gypsy Moth Generally Infested Areas

[Docket No. 01-049-2] received April 29, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6574. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Texas (Splenic) Fever in Cattle; Incorporation by Reference [Docket No. 01-110-1] received April 29, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6575. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Milk in the Upper Midwest Marketing Area; Interim Order Amending the Order [Docket No. AO-361-A35; DA-01-03] received April 29, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6576. A letter from the Vice Chairman, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on a transaction involving U.S. exports to Austria pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

6577. A letter from the Vice Chairman, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on a transaction involving U.S. exports to Malaysia pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

6578. A letter from the Vice Chairman, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on a transaction involving U.S. exports to Israel pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

6579. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Final Rules Relating to Use of Electronic Communication and Recordkeeping Technologies by Employee Pension and Welfare Benefit Plans (RIN: 1270-AA71) received April 9, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6580. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the 2001 Annual Report of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 797(d); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6581. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—The Safe Handling, Transfer, and Receipt of Biological Etiologic Agents at Department of Energy Facilities—received April 24, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6582. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Radiological Worker Training—received April 24, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6583. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Personnel Security Program Manual—received April 24, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6584. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Change of Address; Technical Amendment—received April 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6585. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting The Department's annual report as required by

the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA) of 1986, as amended, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 9620; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6586. A letter from the President, African Development Foundation, transmitting the annual report on audit of the Foundation's Financial Statements for FY 2001, pursuant to 5 app.; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6587. A letter from the Board Members, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting the Board's report entitled "Achievement and Challenges After Two Decades," pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1204(a)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6588. A letter from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting the Board's report entitled "Assessing Federal Job-Seekers in a Delegated Examining Environment," pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1204(a)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6589. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Kentucky Regulatory Program [KY-225-For] received April 24, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6590. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Implementation of the Comprehensive Methamphetamine Control Act of 1996; Regulation of Pseudoephedrine, Phenylpropanolamine, and Combination Ephedrine Drug Products and Reports of Certain Transactions to Nonregulated Persons [DEA NUMBER 163F] (RIN: 1117-AA44) received April 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6591. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Rulings and determination letters (Rev. Proc. 2001-61) received April 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6592. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Contributions by Employer to Accident and Health Plans (Rev. Rul. 2002-3) received April 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6593. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Low-Income Housing Tax Credit-2002 Calendar Year Resident Population Estimates (Notice 2002-13) received April 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6594. A letter from the Chief, Regulation Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Weighted Average Interest Rate Update (Notice 2001-80) received April 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6595. A letter from the Chief, Regulation Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Weighted Average Interest Rate Update (Notice 2002-16) received April 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6596. A letter from the Chief, Regulation Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Amendment, Check the box Regulations (RIN: 1545-AY16) received April 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6597. A letter from the Chief, Regulation Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—New Markets Tax Credit (Notice 2001-75) received April 22, 2002,

pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2672. A bill to designate the United States courthouse to be constructed at 8th Avenue and Mill Street in Eugene, Oregon, as the "Wayne Lyman Morse United States Courthouse" (Rept. 107-428). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2911. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 5100 Paint Branch Parkway in College Park, Maryland, as the "Harvey W. Wiley Federal Building" (Rept. 107-429). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 4006. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 100 Federal Plaza in Central Islip, New York, as the "Alfonse M. D'Amato United States Courthouse" (Rept. 107-430). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 4028. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 600 West Capitol Avenue in Little Rock, Arkansas, as the "Richard S. Arnold United States Courthouse" (Rept. 107-431). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MANZULLO. Committee on Small Business. H.R. 2867. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to require the Administrator to submit certain disagreements to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget for resolution, and to establish a minimum period for the solicitation of offers for a bundled contract (Rept. 107-432). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MANZULLO. Committee on Small Business. H.R. 4231. A bill to improve small business advocacy, and for other purposes (Rept. 107-433). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. COBLE (for himself and Mr. BERMAN):

H.R. 4640. A bill to provide criminal penalties for providing false information in registering a domain name on the Internet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 4641. A bill to allocate spectrum for the enhancement of wireless telecommunications, and to invest wireless spectrum auction proceeds for the military preparedness and educational preparedness of the United States for the digital era, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KERNS:

H.R. 4642. A bill to repeal the law banning firearms in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself and Mr. CANNON):

H.R. 4643. A bill to provide for the special application of the antitrust laws to certain negotiations of freelance writers and free-

lance artists for the sale of their written and graphic material to publishers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ACKERMAN (for himself and Mr. WELDON of Florida):

H.R. 4644. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to testing pregnant women and newborn infants for infection with the human immunodeficiency virus; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BACA (for himself, Mr. TURNER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HOYER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. ORTIZ, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. OWENS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. PHELPS, and Mr. BAIRD):

H.R. 4645. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the sale or rental of adult video games to minors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. QUINN, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. COYNE, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. FROST, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. SHIMKUS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HORN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. OLVER, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. HINCHY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. McNULTY, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MATHESON, Ms. LEE, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. GORDON, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. REYES, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. WEINER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MOORE, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. HOFFEL, Mr. BACA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 4646. A bill to remedy certain effects of injurious steel imports by protecting benefits of steel industry retirees and encouraging the strengthening of the American steel industry; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FOSSELLA (for himself, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. KING):

H.R. 4647. A bill to provide for satisfaction of judgements from frozen assets of terrorists, terrorist organizations, and State sponsors of terrorism, and for other purposes; to

the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H.R. 4648. A bill to provide for the disposition of weapons-usable plutonium at the Savannah River Site, Aiken, South Carolina; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H.R. 4649. A bill to adjust the immigration status of certain Haitian nationals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEFLEY:

H.R. 4650. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to improve airport security by using biometric security badges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HERGER:

H.R. 4651. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for installment reporting of certain gain from the sale of an interest in service business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KILPATRICK:

H.R. 4652. A bill to prevent fraud and deception in network recreational games; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. GORDON, Mr. DICKS, Mr. WEINER, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. HONDA, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. RIVERS, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN):

H.R. 4653. A bill to enable the United States to maintain its leadership in aeronautics and aviation by instituting an initiative to develop technologies that will enable future aircraft with significantly lower noise, emissions, and fuel consumption; to reinvigorate basic and applied research in aeronautics and aviation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York (for herself and Mrs. BONO):

H.R. 4654. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide programs to improve nurse retention, the nursing workplace, and the quality of care; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 4655. A bill to ensure that all States address domestic and sexual violence in their temporary assistance to needy families program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MINK of Hawaii:

H.R. 4656. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to establish requirements for the designation of critical habitat in Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO (for herself and Mrs. TAUSCHER):

H.R. 4657. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to implement the Calfed Bay-Delta Program; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PENCE (for himself, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. SIMMONS):

H.R. 4658. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to punish persons who use false or misleading domain names to attract children to Internet sites not appropriate for children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUNUNU:

H.R. 4659. A bill to streamline the regulatory processes applicable to home health agencies under the Medicare Program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act and the Medicaid Program under title XIX of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THORNBERRY (for himself, Ms. HARMAN, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. ROEMER):

H.R. 4660. A bill to establish the Department of National Homeland Security and the National Office for Combating Terrorism; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 4661. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to direct the Postal Service to adhere to an equitable tender policy in selecting air carriers of nonpriority bypass mail to certain points in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. KELLER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio):

H.J. Res. 91. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to protect the rights of crime victims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA (for himself, Mr. HANSEN, and Mr. RAHALL):

H. Con. Res. 395. Concurrent resolution celebrating the 50th anniversary of the constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Con. Res. 396. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued by the United States Postal Service honoring Tito Puente; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. WYNN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HOYER, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia):

H. Res. 409. A resolution commending public servants and members of the uniformed services for their dedication and continued service to the Nation; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. WOLF, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. KING):

H. Res. 410. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding human rights violations in Tibet, the Panchen Lama, and the need for dialogue between the Chinese leadership and the Dalai Lama or his representatives; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. WU:

H. Res. 411. A resolution supporting the goals of Taiwanese American Heritage Week, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas introduced a bill (H.R. 4662) for the relief of Sharif Kesbeh, Asmaa Sharif Kesbeh, Batool Kesbeh, Noor Sharif Kesbeh, Alaa Kesbeh, Sondas Kesbeh, Hadeel Kesbeh, and Mohanned Kesbeh; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 97: Mr. FRANK.
H.R. 111: Mr. BONIOR.
H.R. 218: Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 488: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 491: Mr. RUSH, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 537: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 572: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky.
H.R. 602: Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. BASS.
H.R. 638: Mr. DINGELL.
H.R. 647: Mr. DEMINT.
H.R. 730: Mr. HOYER.
H.R. 745: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 817: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 831: Mr. BAKER.
H.R. 854: Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. COBLE, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. McKEON, and Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 937: Mr. REHBERG.
H.R. 951: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 1037: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.
H.R. 1086: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1092: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota and Mr. McHUGH.
H.R. 1110: Mr. VISCLOSKEY.
H.R. 1171: Mr. BISHOP and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
H.R. 1181: Mr. CANTOR.
H.R. 1322: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 1324: Mr. RUSH, Mr. KANJORSKI, and Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 1360: Mr. McHUGH.
H.R. 1520: Ms. BALDWIN and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 1541: Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 1543: Mr. GILMAN and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
H.R. 1556: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 1581: Mr. BERRY.
H.R. 1598: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. McKEON, and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 1624: Mr. THUNE, Mr. VITTER, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. KIND, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. BOUTCHER, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. POMBO, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 1642: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. WAXMAN, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1674: Mr. BARCIA.
H.R. 1682: Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 1723: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. VITTER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FROST, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. GORDON, Mr. KIRK, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DOOLEY of California, and Mr. HILL.
H.R. 1774: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.
H.R. 1795: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CLEMENT, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. BLUNT.
H.R. 1859: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island and Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 1935: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. TOWNS.

- H.R. 1978: Ms. VELAZQUEZ.
H.R. 1983: Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 2095: Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 2148: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BONIOR, and Ms. LEE.
H.R. 2373: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. HILLEARY.
H.R. 2483: Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. EVANS, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. BERRY, Mr. ROSS, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 2484: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LEACH, Mr. FORD, and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 2570: Mr. McNULTY.
H.R. 2573: Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 2610: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Mr. MOORE.
H.R. 2629: Mr. DOOLEY of California and Mr. BISHOP.
H.R. 2638: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. HAYES, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. CLAY, Mr. WHITFIELD, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. ISAKSON.
H.R. 2649: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 2662: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. DOOLEY of California.
H.R. 2714: Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. EHRLICH, and Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 2812: Mr. McNULTY.
H.R. 2820: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 2829: Mr. EDWARDS.
H.R. 2830: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 2874: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky.
H.R. 3267: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 3270: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mrs. EMERSON.
H.R. 3273: Mr. PICKERING.
H.R. 3321: Mr. BOYD and Mr. WELLER.
H.R. 3351: Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. JEFF MILLER of Florida, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. PASTOR, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.
H.R. 3363: Mr. PASTOR, Mr. ANDREWS, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LEACH, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. NUSSLE, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H.R. 3372: Mr. BONIOR.
H.R. 3414: Ms. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 3431: Mr. SHOWS, Mrs. BONO, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. TERRY, Mr. TURNER, Mr. MCCRERY, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. WALSH, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. FORD, Mr. LUTHER, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 3462: Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. KING, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. ISSA, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. FORD, and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 3479: Mr. GANSKE.
H.R. 3486: Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.
H.R. 3569: Mr. MORAN of Kansas and Mr. WATT of North Carolina.
H.R. 3609: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. NEY, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LAMPSON, and Mr. OTTER.
H.R. 3705: Mr. HUNTER and Mr. GIBBONS.
H.R. 3710: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 3770: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 3771: Mr. STUPAK.
H.R. 3815: Mr. RAHALL and Mr. HANSEN.
H.R. 3827: Mr. TIAHRT.
H.R. 3831: Mr. OSE, Mr. GONZALEZ and Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 3834: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SUNUNU, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H.R. 3882: Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. ISSA, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. SUNUNU.
H.R. 3890: Mr. WALSH and Mr. BONIOR.
H.R. 3911: Mr. ROTHMAN.
H.R. 3916: Mrs. KELLY.
H.R. 3974: Mr. SAWYER.
H.R. 3989: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
H.R. 3992: Mr. HOYER and Mr. INSLEE.
H.R. 3995: Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 4003: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 4013: Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. SUNUNU.
H.R. 4017: Ms. BROWN of Florida and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 4018: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 4033: Ms. KILPATRICK.
H.R. 4037: Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
H.R. 4039: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 4066: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. WALSH, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. BISHOP.
H.R. 4071: Mr. PETRI, Mr. PUTNAM, and Mr. KELLER.
H.R. 4075: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 4078: Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. FRANK.
H.R. 4085: Mr. JEFF MILLER of Florida and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 4181: Mr. ROHRABACHER.
H.R. 4194: Mr. RANGEL, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. FORD.
H.R. 4231: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.
H.R. 4479: Mr. FROST.
H.R. 4515: Mr. SUNUNU, and Mr. COSTELLO.
H.R. 4550: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 4560: Ms. DUNN and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 4574: Mr. VISCLOSKEY and Mr. LAHOOD.
H.R. 4582: Mr. BONIOR.
H.R. 4589: Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. SCHAFER.
H.R. 4596: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. FROST.
H.R. 4604: Ms. HART.
H.R. 4612: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. HILLEARY.
H.R. 4614: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 4615: Mr. COMBEST.
H.R. 4623: Mr. WAMP, Mr. PENCE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. OSBORNE.
H.R. 4627: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 4630: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. BARRETT.
H.R. 4634: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.
H.R. 4635: Mr. THUNE, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. SCHAFER, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. SANDLIN, and Mr. CULBERSON.
H. Con. 213: Mr. LEACH.
H. Con. 315: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.
H. Con. Res. 345: Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HOLT, Ms. WATSON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. PALLONE.
H. Con. Res. 352: Mr. PASCRELL.
H. Con. Res. 368: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H. Con. Res. 385: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. McNULTY, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H. Con. Res. 390: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. BOYD, Mr. FROST, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ENGLISH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KIND, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H. Con. Res. 393: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD and Mr. FROST.
H. Con. Res. 394: Mr. MEEKS of New York.
H. Res. 392: Mr. HORN, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. KIRK, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. LINDER, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. BAKER, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. FLETCHER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. GORDON, Mr. OSE, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WAMP, Mr. SHAW, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. KINGSTON, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. VITTER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. EDWARDS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. BASS, and Mr. FLAKE.
H. Res. 394: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.